



As-Sawaa'iq as-Salafiyyah al-Mursalah 'Alal-Afkaar al-Qutubiyyah al-Mudammirah

Part 1: The Creed of Imaam al-Albaani on Kufr

In Defence of the Creed of Imaam al-Albaani From the Neo-Qutubic Assault

O Sunni, that which most aptly describes the realities of the da'wah today is:

In his personal letter sent to Shaikh Abdul-Azeez Aal ash-Shaikh, Mufti of Saudi Arabia and head of the Permanent Committee, shortly after the issuing of the verdict concerning Shaikh Ali Hasan's two books on the subject of takfir and ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, Shaikh Sa'd al-Hussain stated, "As for these brothers (the Jordanian Mashaayikh), I have known them for around fifteen years... and they by Allaah, are the best of those I know - I do not say in Jordan alone - but in the whole of Shaam, in terms of knowledge, manhaj (methodology) and da'wah (calling to Allaah)... **As for this doubt of Irjaa' which Shaytaan has placed upon the tongues of their opponents, then they (the opponents) have only made this accusation against them because they are calling to the Manhaj of Nubuwwah (Prophetic Methodology), the manhaj that opposes the ways and methods of the Takfeeris (takfeeriyyoon) such as the likes of Sayyid Qutb, Hasan at-Turaabi and others amongst the biased partisans and political activists...**" (Refer to "Rihlati Ilaa Bilaad ul-Haramayn")

Contents

Foreword

Introduction

The Dialogue in the Cassette Kufr Kufraan

Part 1: **LAYING THE FOUNDATIONS**

Part 2: **SHAIKH KHALID AL-ANBARI ON THE CREED OF AL-ALBAANI**

Part 3: **THE CREED OF IMAAM AL-ALBAANI AS NARRATED BY HIS STUDENTS**

Part 4: **UNDERSTANDING THE DISCUSSION**

Closing Remarks

Foreword

All Praise is due to Allaah, we praise Him, seek His aid and His Forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allaah from the evils of our souls and the evils of our actions. Whomsoever Allaah guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allaah misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, alone, without any partners and I bear witness that Muhammad is His servant and messenger.

O you who believe! Fear Allaah as He should be feared, and die not except in a state of Islaam (as Muslims) with complete submission to Allaah. (Aali Imraan 3:103)

O mankind! Be dutiful to your Lord, Who created you from a single person (Adam), and from him (Adam) He created his wife [Hawwa (Eve)], and from them both He created many men and women and fear Allaah through Whom you demand your mutual (rights), and (do not cut the relations of) the wombs (kinship). Surely, Allaah is Ever an All-Watcher over you. (An-Nisaa 4:1)

O you who believe! Keep your duty to Allaah and fear Him, and speak (always) the truth. He will direct you to do righteous good deeds and will forgive you your sins. And whosoever obeys Allaah and His Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) he has indeed achieved a great achievement (i.e. he will be saved from the Hell-fire and made to enter Paradise). (Al-Ahzaab 33:70-71)

To proceed, verily the best speech is the Book of Allaah and the best of guidance is the guidance of Muhammad (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam). And the worst of affairs are the newly invented matters, every newly-invented matter is an innovation, every innovation is misguidance and all misguidance is in the Hellfire.

Introduction

In his personal letter sent to Shaikh Abdul-Azeez Aal ash-Shaikh, Mufti of Saudi Arabia and head of the Permanent Committee, shortly after the issuing of the verdict concerning Shaikh Ali Hasan's two books on the subject of takfir and ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, Shaikh Sa'd al-Hussain stated, **"As for these brothers (the Jordanian Mashaayikh), I have known them for around fifteen years... and they by Allaah, are the best of those I know - I do not say in Jordan alone - but in the whole of Shaam, in terms of knowledge, manhaj (methodology) and da'wah (calling to Allaah)¹... As for this doubt of Irjaa' which Shaytaan has placed upon the tongues of their opponents, then they (the opponents) have only made this accusation against them because they are calling to the Manhaj of Nubuwwah (Prophetic Methodology), the manhaj that opposes the ways and methods of the Takfeeris (takfeeriyyoon) such as the likes of Sayyid Qutb, Hasan at-Turaabi and others amongst the biased partisans and political activists..."** (Refer to "Rihlati Ilaa Bilaad ul-Haramayn")

You should know, O Sunni, that what has been stated by Shaikh Sa'd al-Hussain is a pertinent and most appropriate and highly accurate description of the actual state of affairs today, and of the affairs of the Salafi Da'wah today and of the affairs of the "Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah", the Khawaarij of the Era. And know that another most pertinent and appropriate statement is:

"All the Ahl ul-Ahwaa are united upon the hatred of Imaam al-Albaani and his manhaj (even though they may outwardly portray otherwise) and all of the Ahl ul-Ahwaa are united upon the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb (even though they may outwardly portray otherwise)."

Remember, this well O Sunni, and many things will become as clear as daylight to you. In fact, if you understand this well and keep it in the back of your mind, much of the fitnah of today will be put in its proper context, and then you will see where the beautifiers of speech, the straying wanderers, those adulterated in their manhaj and who have only one concern, to busy the Ummah with takfir and haakimiyyah, you will then see where they stand and where they fit in.

Recently, a 112 page document emerged which passed itself off as a "Decisive Refutation of SalafiPublications.Com" and which comprised attempts to prove that Imaam al-Albaani shares with the Extremist Murji'ah in his views on Imaan and Takfir. The article was written by someone from Canada called Abu Huthayfah Yusuf al-Kanadie, and is actually centred around two individuals, Imaam al-Albaani and Shaikh Khaalid al-Anbari and attempts to ascribe Extremist Irjaa' to them both. The main bulk of the article is based around refuting the statements of Imaam al-Albaani – based upon some of his statements that occurred on cassette – and also refuting the clarifications of Khaalid al-Anbaree in his reply to the

¹ And at the same time we do not claim anyone is infallible after the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), rather everyone can err and can also be correct...

Permanent Committee, after their verdict concerning his book. The contents of the article can be summarised as follows:

- 1) Proving that Imaam al-Albaani does not hold that kufr can occur by actions
- 2) Proving that Imaam al-Albaani considers Imaan to be Tasdeeq
- 3) Proving that Khalid al-Anbari is an Extreme Murji'
- 4) Proving that Khalid al-Anbari twists and lies and distorts the sayings of the scholars
- 5) Proving that the verse in al-Maa'idah refers to the major kufr absolutely
- 6) Proving that the narrations from Ibn Abbaas in tafseer of the verse in Surah al-Maa'idah are weak and not to be relied upon and proving that Ibn 'Abbaas considered the verse in al-Maa'idah to be indicative of major kufr
- 7) Attempting to justify his position on ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed by quoting from many of the scholars of the Salaf on the issue of general legislation, tabdeel, secular law and the likes.
- 8) A refutation of SalafiPublications.Com by default, in all of these issues, since they have stood by the views of Imaam al-Albaani and Khalid al-Anbari
- 9) An illustration of the deceit of SalafiPublications.Com and their twisting and distorting the words of the Scholars.

And also many other subsidiary matters. In this series we will reply to the author of this document, and illustrate his nature and orientation and to answer his claims inshaa'allaah and also illustrate in the process, his ignorance, his invalid deductions, his making the words of the likes of Imaam al-Albaani, to carry meanings and contexts that they do not in fact carry and much more.

It is vital to point out that the reference points of this individual are the likes of Abu Baseer Mustafah Halimah – a well known Takfiri based in Syria, Safar al-Hawali, Mohammad Qutb and others from the neo-Kharijite Think Tank – who have emerged in the current times and have promoted the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb of takfir and haakimiyyah. And all of these are actually united upon the hatred of Imaam al-Albaani as we shall see in other discourses. It is also clear from the tone and nature of the author of this “Decisive Refutation” that his desperation is to prove, once and for all, that Imaam al-Albaani is upon Extremist Irjaa' and that ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is major kufr, (alal itlaaq) absolutely. His confusion in this regard will be pointed out in a later discourse, if Allaah wills, as well as his selective quoting of certain statements, inshaa'allaah, and also his lack of familiarity with some of the sayings of our Scholars, such as Imaam Ibn Baaz and others. What is very apparent is that this individual is upon the Qutubi da'wah – even though he might proclaim otherwise – and has taken his teachings from Safar al-Hawali and Mohammad Qutb. We see his orientation from his isnaad, chain of narration, which is actually Abu Baseer Mustafah Haleemah, Safar al-Hawali, Mohammad Qutb, and this is why we say that he has affectations to the doctrine of Qutubism – even though he will negate it and deny it, yet his true referent points, and the books he has relied upon are the clearest of evidences to indicate that he is affected by Qutubism.

Anyhow, this first part will deal with the statements of Imaam al-Albaani in a cassette titled “Kufr Kufraan” and which have been used by some to ascribe Irjaa' to Imaam al-Albaani. We

shall establish certain principles in the first part of this discourse, then in light of these principles come to understand the discussion that took place in the aforementioned cassette, and also highlight the fabrications of Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie against Imaam al-Albaani, and his extremely poor understanding and his twisting and distorting the Shaikhs' words – rather using wicked forms of twisted arguments...wal-Iyaadhu billaah.

In Part 1, we will deal with the discussion that occurs on the cassette “Kufr Kufraan” (1996), and which has used by neo-Qutubite elements to ascribe Irjaa' to Imaam al-Albaani.

The Dialogue in The Cassette “Kufr Kufraan”.

The author of the article (that attempts to refute Imaam al-Albaani) relied upon an excerpt from a tape called “Kufr Kufraan” (1996) in which there is a discussion between Imaam al-Albaani and a questioner on the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed. The essence of the discussion is that the questioner had not grasped the position and understanding of Imaam al-Albaani concerning al-kufr al-‘amali and al-kufr al-i’tiqadee (which is explained in this article) and based upon this misunderstanding he failed to understand the Shaikh’s perspective and angle. As for the author of the “Decisive Refutation”, then as is typical, he has based his whole evaluation of the creed of Imaam al-Albaani on one or two discussions that took place, without researching into the sum total of what Imaam al-Albaani has either said or written in other places – mainly due to his inability in this regard.

When we wish to know the aqeedah of one of the Imaams who has passed away, then we do not look at Abu Fulaan in Canada who takes two discussions from two cassettes, from an Imaam whose life has spanned around 80 years or so, over 60 of which were spent in Tawheed, Sunnah, Knowledge, Aqeedah and so on – who has authored hundreds of volumes and thousands of cassette lectures – and in all of that, Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie has relied upon those who are known to be upon the madhhab of takfir and khaarijiyyah, such as Abu Baseer Mustafah Haleemah and Safar al-Hawaali, in their bid ascribe Irjaa’ to Imaam al-Albaani. The asl, basic principle with someone who is known to be an Imaam of the Sunnah, is that where generalised statements occur, then we look at the specific statements made elsewhere, in light of which we understand his general statements. And this is where the great mistake of the newly-arisen ones lies. They persist in quoting only from those places in which they find generalised or ambiguous statements, upon which they can build their theories. In what is to follow, this will become clear inshaa’allaah. Further, when the creed of an Imaam is in dispute, then reference is made to those from the People of Knowledge who know him and are equal to him, **and more importantly, to his students**, so that they can transmit what they know to be the creed of this Imaam, due to their acquaintance with him and his writings and his statements and so on.

Anyhow, in the first part we will lay down the foundations of our reply, by looking at the actual understanding of Imaam al-Albaani on kufr and how he categorises it. After that we will visit the actual discussion that the author of the “Decisive Refutation” relied upon in order to accuse Imaam al-Albaani and to illustrate to him that he has actually misread the whole discussion – due of course, to his total unfamiliarity of the Shaikh’s understanding and teaching in this regard, and has also lied upon the Shaikh and claimed that he intended certain meanings which in reality he did not.

PART 1: LAYING THE FOUNDATIONS

O Sunni, seclude yourself for an hour or so and pay great attention to what is to follow. For if you grasp all of this, then by Allaah, you will have acquired much good, and you will have understood how the da'wah of Sayyid Qutb and Mohammad Qutb² has been entered into the ranks of the Salafis, at the hands of those labelled as “Khaarjiyyah Asriyyah” by Imaam al-Albaani.

That with which we worship our Lord is that kufr can occur by beliefs, (i'tiqaad), statements (qawl) and actions ('amal). Some of the Ulamaa have categorised kufr into the major disbelief (kufr akbar) and the minor disbelief (kufr asghar, kufr doona kufr)³. **And they included within the major disbelief, the beliefs, statements and actions that expel from the fold of Islaam.**

And some of the Ulamaa have understood kufr to be the kufr of action (kufr 'amali) and the kufr of belief (kufr i'tiqadi)⁴ **and their intent behind this is to illustrate that amongst the**

² Abdul-Malik ar-Ramadhaanee, the author of Madaarik un-Nadhar, stated, “The delegate of Alee bin Haaj in The Algerian Front (FIS), called al-Hashimi Sahnouni used to label everyone who did not perform takfir of the rulers with this name, “Murji”. So when I asked him, what was his reference point for this, he said, ‘**Mohammad Qutb and ‘Abdur-Rahman Abdul-Khaliq’.**” (Refer to Madaarik un-Nadhar).

³ Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah said, “Allah differentiates among believers; so he who achieves the required Imaan deserves reward, but he who has some hypocrisy and has committed major sins is among those threatened with punishment. His Iman will benefit him and remove him from the Fire, even if he has a mustard seed's weight of Imaan. However, he does not deserve the absolute Imaan on which depends the promise of entering Paradise without first being punished. To summarize, there are people who have a degree of unbelief [or hypocrisy] as well as a degree of Iman. As Ahmad Ibn Hanbal said, such people are called Muslims.

Thus, a human being may have some degree of Iman and some degree of hypocrisy, or he could be a Muslim who is guilty of [minor] unbelief, which does not exclude him from Islam completely, as Ibn Abbas and others have said. This is what Ahmad Ibn Hanbal said concerning the thief, the drunkard, and so on, whom our Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) considered to be Muslims but not believers. Reference is made to the Quran and the Sunnah to demonstrate that such a person has Iman but not Islam. **A man could be a Muslim and have unbelief that does not take him away from the Muslim community since unbelief is of two kinds: that which excludes one from Islam, and that which results from neglect of deeds, which does not exclude him from Islam, but causes him to be a mere Muslim rather than a believer.** This is how Ibn Abbaas and his companions interpret Allah's saying: “... If any do fail to judge by what Allah reveals, those are the unbelievers” (5:44). They say that unbelief that does not exclude one from the Muslim community is unbelief of a lesser degree than unbelief, sin of a lesser degree than sin, and wrongdoing of a lesser degree than wrongdoing.

This is also cited by al-Bukhari in the first chapter of his Saheeh entitled The Book of Belief in which he indicates that deeds are part of Imaan. Here he includes the ideas of Orthodox Muslims as well as refutations of the Murji'ites as he was a supporter of the Sunnah and the Orthodox Muslims who in turn sincerely followed the Companions of the Prophet and their Successors.” Kitab ul-Imaan pp. 344-345.

⁴ Ibn al-Qayyim said, “...And the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) negated Imaan from the fornicator, thief, and the one who consumes khamr, intoxicants. And also from the one whose neighbours are not safe from his evil. **So when the label of Imaan has been negated from such a one, then he is a disbeliever from the point of view of his action**, but the kufr of juhood and belief (i'tiqad) has been negated from him. It is likewise in his (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam's) saying, “Do not become disbelievers after me, striking the necks of one another.” Kitaab us-Salaat of Ibn al-Qayyim

actions that have been given the label of kufr by the texts of the Book and the Sunnah are those that do not expel from the fold of Islaam and are hence they called them the kufr of action (kufr 'amali). Facing this is what they called the kufr of belief (kufr i'tiqadi) and they included within this kufr of belief (al-kufr al-i'tiqadi), the beliefs, statements **and actions** that expel from the fold of Islaam.

To illustrate the first type of categorisation⁵, Ibn al-Qayyim said, **“And there is another principle**, that disbelief, kufr is of two types: a) the kufr of action and b) the kufr of juhood (denial) and 'inaad (stubborn rejection).

As for the kufr of juhood then it is when one disbelieves in what is known to have been brought by the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) from Allaah, out of juhood and 'inaad from amongst the Names, Attributes, Actions and rulings of the Lord. This type of kufr negates faith from every single aspect.

As for the kufr of action, then this divides into two types: 1) A type which negates Imaan and 2) a type which does not negate Imaan. **So prostrating to an idol, belittling the mush-haf (the Qur'an), fighting the Prophet and reviling him negates Imaan (i.e. Islaam). As for ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed and abandoning the prayer, then that is from the kufr of action absolutely.** So the one who rules by other than what Allaah has revealed is a disbeliever and the one who abandons the prayer is a disbeliever due to the textual ruling of the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam), however this is the kufr of action not the kufr of belief.

It is also impossible for Allaah – free is He from imperfection – to call the one who rules by other than what Allaah has revealed to be a disbeliever and for the Messenger of Allaah to call the one who abandons the prayer to be a disbeliever, and then not apply the label of “disbeliever” to them. And the Messenger of Allaah (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) negated Imaan from the fornicator, thief, and the one who consumes khamr, intoxicants. And also from the one whose neighbours are not safe from his evil.

So when the label of Imaan has been negated from such a one, then he is a disbeliever from the point of view of his action, but the kufr of juhood and belief (i'tiqad) has been negated from him . **It is likewise in his (sallallahu alaihi wasallam's) saying, “Do not become disbelievers after me, striking the necks of one another.”** (Kitaab us-Salaat of Ibn al-Qayyim)

We can summarise this as follows (on the next page):

⁵ And Imaam al-Albaani has in fact quoted this saying of Ibn Qayyim himself in his Silsilah as-Saheehah, and has affirmed what is in it, as occurs later in this discourse.

Figure 1: Kufr categorised by Ibn al-Qayyim

KUFR		
	a) KUFR OF JUHOOD⁶	
	b) KUFR OF ACTION	This Includes:
		1) <i>What Negates Imaan Totally</i> Which are those actions that do not require the conditions of belief, or istihlaal, or juhood and the likes and these actions include, mocking the religion, mocking Allaah, kicking the Qur'aan and the likes.
		2) <i>What Does Not Negate Imaan Totally</i> These actions do require the conditions of belief (I'tiqaad) and Istihlaal and the likes.

And what is intended here is that kufr (that expels from the religion) can occur by way of **beliefs, statements and actions** and all of this affirmed in the words of Ibn al-Qayyim.

If we alter the above diagram a bit to be more comprehensive, we get the following:

Figure 2: The Generally Accepted Model of the Categorisation of Kufr

KUFR		
	a) KUFR OF BELIEF (AL-KUFR AL-AKBAR)	Such as Juhood, Takdheeb, Istikbaar, Nifaaq and so on...
	b) KUFR OF ACTION	This Includes:
		1) <i>What Negates Imaan Totally</i> (AL-KUFR AL-AKBAR) Which are those actions that do not require the conditions of belief, or istihlaal, or juhood and the likes and these actions include, mocking the religion, mocking Allaah, kicking the Qur'aan and the likes.
		2) <i>What Does Not Negate Imaan Totally</i> (AL-KUFR AL-ASGHAR) These actions do require the conditions of belief (I'tiqaad) and Istihlaal and the likes.

Imaam al-Albaani considers that there are two types of kufr:

- a) the kufr of action (al-kufr al-'amali) which is synonymous with al-kufr al-asghar, or minor kufr which does not expel from Islaam

⁶ This does not negate the existence of other types of kufr, such as that of pride, arrogance (istikbaar), doubt (shakk), belief (i'tiqaad), hypocrisy (nifaaq) etc., since Ibn al-Qayyim has referred to them elsewhere such as in "Madaarij us-Saalikeen".

- b) the kufr of belief (al-kufr al-i'tiqadi) which to him is synonymous with al-kufr al-akbar, or the major kufr which expels from Islaam

The Shaikh **does not negate however**, that a person can become a Kaafir (with the major kufr) through action, and that there are acts that occur on the limbs that necessitate al-kufr al-akbar, that is, the major kufr that expels from the religion. Rather, he considers these acts to expel from Islaam. **The difference is that he refers all of these acts as being from the second category listed above, that is al-kufr al-i'tiqaadee, or the kufr of belief.** And what will make this evident is some of the quotations that we will quote from him later. This is only a subtle difference, and in a way, the Shaikhs position on kufr, is exactly as in the diagram above

This can be summarised in the following way:

Figure 3: The Categorisation of Kufr as Understood from the statements of al-Albaani

KUFR		
	a) KUFR OF ACTION (AL-KUFR AL-'AMALI) OR (AL-KUFR AL-ASGHAR)	This does not negate Imaan totally and requires the condition of Istihlaal, I'tiqad (belief), Juhood (rejection) and the likes ⁷ .
	b) KUFR OF BELIEF (AL-KUFR AL-I'TIQAADI) OR (AL-KUFR AL-AKBAR)	This includes:
		1) <u>Beliefs</u>
		Such as believing that other than Allaah has knowledge of the Unseen, or rejecting on of Allaah's Names or Attributes out of Juhood and so on.
		2) <u>Statements</u>
		Such as mocking the religion, or the Prophet, or reviling him and the likes.
		3) <u>Actions</u>
		Such as kicking the Qur'an or prostrating to an idol ⁸ .

What is intended here is that Imaam al-Albaani considers that the kufr of belief (or al-kufr al-i'tiqaadee) which expels from Islaam comprises **beliefs** of kufr, **statements** of kufr and **actions** of kufr. The reason for this is that Imaam al-Albaan considers every statement or

⁷ However, the Shaikh, makes exceptions to this al-kufr al-'amali and states that there are some actions on account of which a person disbelieves with kufr of belief. And this quotation will come soon inshaa'allah. So in a way, his understanding is the same as explained in Figure 2, save that he connects this kufr to al-kufr al-I'tiqaadee, and the explanation of this will also come later inshaa'allah.

⁸ The Shaikh considers these acts to be from those acts that are the major acts of kufr, which do not require Istihlaal and the likes. He considers a person to disbelieve with the kufr of belief through them. The kufr of belief (al-kufr al-I'tiqaadee) is synonymous with the major kufr in the view of the Shaikh.

action of (major) kufr to internally necessitate kufr, **and that the kufr upon the limbs (that expels from the religion) is linked to the heart, since the heart is the asl, foundation (as we shall later see) of what occurs on the limbs**⁹.

In other words, statements and actions of kufr are both kufr internally and externally, and it is not possible for a person to commit an act of major kufr (that expels from the religion) upon his tongue and upon his limbs and at the same time remain a believer internally. Rather, he is a kaafir both on the outside and on the inside. It is for this reason that Imaam al-Albaani has chosen to refer to acts of kufr that expel from Islaam to be the kufr of belief (al-kufr al-i'tiqaadee).¹⁰ And in fact, we even see Shaikh Muhammad Ibn Ibraaheem adhering

⁹ The saying of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, “**“The basis of Imaan is in the heart, and this is the speech and action of the heart, and this is its affirmation (iqraar) and assent (tasdeeq) and its love (hubb) and compliance (inqiyaad). And whatever is in the heart then what it necessitates and requires must appear upon the limbs. And when (a person) does not act upon what it necessitates and requires (of the external actions) this indicates its absence or its weakness. And for this reason, the outward actions are from the obligatory requirement of the Imaan of the heart and they are necessarily required by it, and they [the actions] constitute an affirmation (tasdeeq) of what is in the heart, giving evidence (daleel) to it, being a witness (shaahid) over it. And they [the actions] constitute a branch from the totality of Absolute Imaan, forming a part of it. However, whatever is in the heart is the foundation (asl) of what emanates from the limbs.”** Majmoo’ ul-Fataawaa (7/644)

To the Murji'ah, Imaan is only tasdeeq (assent) in the heart and they do not include the actions of the heart (such as love, fear, hope, reliance, submission, and so on). Therefore, to them kufr can only be what is in the heart is of takdheeb (rejection), so they restrict it to takdheeb only. So they always link external actions of kufr to takdheeb and claim external actions of kufr always indicate takdheeb in the heart.

As for Ahl us-Sunnah, then they say that the external acts of kufr are indicative of any of the variety of types of kufr, whether it is nifaaq (hypocrisy), shakk (doubt), istikbaar (pride, arrogance), juhood (rejection), istihzaa (mockery), i'tiqaad (beliefs that necessitate kufr) and so on. However what is sufficient for the judgement of takfir in the case of those actions which nullify Imaan totally (such as kicking the Qur'an or mockery of the religion) is that the conditions of knowledge (ilm) and intent (qasd) be present, meaning a person knew the act was unlawful and necessitates kufr, and that a person intended to commit the act (as opposed to being compelled etc.). It is not necessary for us to know what particular form of kufr gave rise to this act, and since the nature of this act is such that it is a nullification of Imaan, both internally and externally, we make takfir on account of it simply by ensuring the conditions for takfir exist. **However, this at the same time does not negate the link and tie that exists between the heart and the limbs.**

As for the Murji'ah, when an external act of kufr would occur, they would deny that a person can become a kaafir, because they claimed the person still has tasdeeq (assent) in the heart. When they were proven wrong and told that there are certain actions reported in the Sharee'ah which necessitate kufr, they then began to say that the act is not kufr, but it is indicative of takdheeb (rejection, the opposite of tasdeeq) on the inside, and that only this is kufr. Hence, the difference between them and Ahl us-Sunnah is clear and manifest.

¹⁰ IMPORTANT NOTE ABOUT TERMS AND TERMINOLOGY CONCERNING KUFR

We need to point out here that when these terms are used (al-kufr al-amali, al-kufr al-'itiqaadee, al-kufr al-asghar, al-kufr al-akbar) there needs to be clarity between the one speaking and one being addressed so that there is no confusion. Since the way these terms have been understood vary from person to person.

So in the view of some, for example the term **al-kufr al-akbar** refers to the beliefs, statements and actions that negate Imaan totally, and **al-kufr al-asghar** refers to the actions that do not negate Imaan (whether actions of the heart, such as ar-Riyaah, showing off, or actions of the limbs, like fighting against a Muslim).

to this understanding in his Tahkeem ul-Qawaaneen as we shall later see, when we come to whip neo-Qutubic pseudo-intellectual activity with the strong and sturdy chain of Salafi principles.

Anyhow, this second perspective is the one from which Imaam al-Albaani explains his viewpoint, as is apparent from his many explanations and conversations on cassette and otherwise. And it is also the explanation of others from the people of knowledge (and we shall see later from the words of Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah, that the heart is the asl, foundation or root, for what occurs on the limbs).

Pay extreme care to the words of al-Haafidh al-Hakamee, "When it is said to us: Prostrating to an idol, belittling the Book, reviling the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam), jesting about the religion – and so on – all of this is from the kufr of action – from what is apparent – so why then does it also expel from the religion, and you have at the same time, labelled the minor kufr (al-kufr al-asghar) with the kufr of action (al-'amali)? And the reply is: **Know that these four – and whatever resembles them – are not considered to be from the kufr of action except from the point of view that they occur by the actions of the limbs as observed by the people. However, [in reality], they do not occur except with the passing away of the action of the heart – of intention (niyyah), sincerity (ikhlaas), love (mahabbah) and compliance (inqiyaad) – none of that remains.** So therefore, these actions, even though they occur by [physical] action [of the limbs] outwardly, **they in fact necessitate (mustalzimah) the kufr of belief (al-kufr al-i'tiqadi), and there is no escaping from this...**" Then he said, "And we do not define the minor kufr (al-kufr al-asghar) with the kufr of action (al-'amali) absolutely and unrestrictedly – [but merely as occurring by action alone, which does not necessitate a belief (i'tiqad) (that negates Imaan), and which does not negate the speech (i.e. the belief) of the heart, and nor its action]¹¹." (A'laam us-Sunnah al-Manshoorah pp.181-182). End of his words.

This is because every external action that is kufr (that negates Imaan from every aspect), also internally necessitates kufr. And hence it is the kufr of belief (al-kufr al-i'tiqadi) by default. Now listen to the words of Imaam al-Albaani, which explains this fine point: **"And amongst the actions are those on account of which a person actually disbelieves with the kufr of**

Yet others say, that there is **al-kufr al-i'tiqadi** which refers to the beliefs, statements and actions that negate Imaan totally, on the one hand an **al-kufr al-'amali** which refers to the actions that do not negate Imaan totally.

However, others say there is **al-kufr al-i'tiqadi**, which refers only to the kufr of the heart (like Juhood, Istihlaal, Istikbaar etc.) and then al-kufr al-'amali which is the kufr of action. Then they divide the latter into two types, **al-kufr al-'amali al-asghar** (the minor kufr of action that does not negate Imaan totally) and **al-kufr al-'amali al-akbar** (the major kufr of action that does negate Imaan totally).

It is important to bear all of this in mind, since part of the confusion lies in what is being intended by the terminology used. And when we come to look at the discussion in the cassette "Kufr Kufraan" we will see how that oppressive forelock of al-Kanadie has manipulated these various understandings and terms in order to twist Shaikh al-Albaani's words and ascribe meanings to the Shaikh that he did not actually intend with his words.

¹¹ And what has been put in square brackets here is exactly what Imaam al-Albaani intends by his reference to al-kufr al-'amali.

belief (I'tiqaadiyy) (i.e. apostatises). This is because such actions show his disbelief with absolute certainty and decisiveness in the sense that when a person commits them, it is as if he is actually expressing his disbelief with his tongue, such as the one who kicks the Qur'an while he knows it is the Qur'an and intending to kick it, deliberately..." Refer to Fitnah of Takfir (p.72, 1st edition, 1417H). And this also shows that the Shaikh affirms the link between the internal and the external, i.e. between the heart and the actions of the limbs.

And this statement is the exact replica of the various statements of Shaikh ul-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah such as, "So whoever uttered a statement of kufr **without having any need for uttering it, doing it deliberately, knowing that it is a statement of disbelief, then he becomes a disbeliever through that both externally (dhahiran) and internally (batinan) and it is not permissible for it to be said that it is possible for him to still remain a believer internally...**" and also "And whoever reviled Allaah or the Messenger, **then he disbelieves both externally and internally...**" See as-Saarim al-Maslool (p.513-515). Meaning he disbelieves with al-kufr al-i'tiqaadee, if you use that term, or al-kufr al-akbar, if you wish to use that term.

And the statement of Imaam al-Albani quoted above is parallel to the refutation of the Jahmiyyah contained in the statements of Shaikh ul-Islam such as, "So those who speak with the view of Jahm and as-Saalihee have made it clear that reviling Allaah and His Messenger and saying that Allaah is one of three (i.e. the Trinity) **and every other statement of disbelief is not internal disbelief**, but it is in reality an outward indication of disbelief and despite this it is possible for this one who reviled to be one who acknowledges Allaah, unifying (his belief and worship) **for Him and a believer in Him internally**. So when the proof is established against them, either by way of textual evidence or a consensus on this issue, they reply, **"This means that such acts necessitate internal rejection, takdheeb."** Majmoo Fataawaa (7/557).

In fact, Imaam al-Albaani actually quotes in meaning the saying of Ibn al-Qayyim we quoted at the very beginning in his as-Silsilah as-Saheehah (7/134), saying, "Ibn al-Qayyim has afforded the meaning – rahimahullaah [in his Kitaab us-Salaat], that kufr is of two types: a) the kufr of action and b) the kufr of juhood (rejection) and belief (i'tiqaad). **And that the kufr of action divides into 1) what negates Imaan and 2) what does not negate Imaan.** Hence, prostrating to an idol, and belittling the Mus-haf (Qur'aan) and attempting to kill the Prophet and reviling him negates Imaan (from every aspect). And as for ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed and abandonment of prayer, then that is from the kufr of action, absolutely."

Then after quoting this in the main body of the text, the Shaikh adds a note, saying, "Sometimes that action (i.e. leaving the prayer) can sometimes be from the kufr of belief as well. And this is when something is connected to it which indicates the corrupt nature of his aqeedah, such as his mockery of the prayer and those who pray, or his preferring to face death rather than pray, when he is invited to pray by the Ruler, as will be mentioned shortly, so remember this for it is important."

And the above note also shows that Shaikh al-Albaani considers those actions that expel from Islaam to be al-kufr al-i'tiqaadee.

In the cassette 'At-Tahreer Li Masaa'il it-Takfir', a discussion between Shaikh Khaalid al-Anbari and Imaam al-Albani, there occurs, concerning the matter of Takfir:

Shaikh Khalid al-Anbari read out the statement, "And there is no doubt that the kufr that expels from the religion – as is understood by Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah – **is of six types and it is not just a single type**: (these being): takdhib (rejection), juhood (denial), 'inaad (wilful resistance), nifaq (hypocrisy), i'raad (turning away), shakk (doubt)." **Imaam al-Albani affirmed this and agreed with this perfectly.**

Then there occurs later in the tape: Shaikh Khaalid al-Anbari: "...**therefore, I have understood from you right now that your saying is that indeed, kufr occurs by belief, and it occurs also by speech, and it occurs also by...**". Imaam al-Albani: interjecting, "...**by action** (amal)".¹²

In short, there is no real difference between those who say that there is the kufr of belief and also the kufr of action and that the latter is itself divided into two types, that which negates Imaan and that which does not negate Imaan – so there is no difference between these and between those who say that there is the kufr of action which does not expel from Islaam (and this is in reference to the minor kufr, al-kufr al-asghar) and that there is the kufr of belief, and that the latter comprises beliefs, statements and actions – all of which expel from Islaam. This is a difference in wording only. And this is because the true nature of those actions which are major kufr is such that they negate a person's Imaan both internally and externally, and because there is a fundamental link between the actions of the limbs and the speech of the heart, and that whatever is in the heart, manifests itself on the limbs and whatever is upon the limbs shows what is upon the heart.

Here, a very important additional clarification needs to be made, and this is where the ignorance of those who are hell-bent on ascribing Irjaa' to Imaam al-Albaani is clearly and manifestly displayed.

What we have quoted above from Imaam al-Albaani indicates that there is a clear and manifest link between the actions of the limbs and the actions of the heart. And that what occurs on the limbs is indicative of what is in the heart. And that what occurs on the limbs of kufr is indicative of what is in the heart. **However, the heart is the asl, foundation of what occurs on the limbs.**

Consider the saying of Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah, "**And this is because the asl (foundation, basis) of Imaan and Nifaaq is in the heart. And certainly, whatever appears of statements and actions is a branch (of this asl, foundation), and is indicative (daleel) of it.**"

¹² And these quotations are actually discarded by the neo-Qutubiyyah, may Allaah kill their desires, for they are not interested in bringing together all of the Shaikh's statements, and trying to reconcile them and to understand the general statements in light of the specific and explicit ones.

Hence, whenever something occurs from a person (of statements and actions) pertaining to that, then the ruling falls upon him [based upon that]..." (as-Saarim al-Maslool 2/76).

He also said, "And revilement (sabb) is speech that does not continue and remain, rather it is like the fleeting actions like killing and fornication (i.e. they cease), and what occurs in this manner, then the ruling upon it is to punish the one who falls into it, absolutely. This is in opposition to when killing (someone) is on account of (his) apostasy or for original kufr (i.e. an original kaafir). For he is killed, because his (kufr) is present (mawjood, haadir) when he is killed. **This is because kufr is belief (li'annal-kufr i'tiqaad), and belief (i'tiqaad) remains present in the heart, and it becomes apparent that it is belief (i'tiqaad) [in the heart] on account of what emerges from speech and what is like that...**" (as-Saarim al-Maslool 3/856).

Now, the faculties of the tongues of those upon whom Satan has placed the accusation of Irjaa' have failed to realise the difference between what has been stated above and between the positions and beliefs of the Extremist Murji'ah.

The Jahmiyyah and the Extremist Murji'ah and their likes were in error because, based upon their erroneous definition of Imaan that it is only tasdeeq (assent) of the heart (in the case of the Ash'ariyyah) or ma'rifah (knowledge) in the heart (in the case of the Jahmiyyah), they considered firstly, that a person cannot become a disbeliever through any external action, and then when they were proven wrong in this, they then began to say, that this (external action) is only kufr because of the absence of tasdeeq (or the presence of its opposite, takdheeb, rejection).

The Extremist Murji'ah say either:

- a) that the act itself is not kufr¹³ at all, externally or internally, but it is just indicative of kufr, or
- b) that it is only kufr because of the presence in the heart of the opposite of what they define as Imaan (i.e. the presence of takdheeb which cancels out tasdeeq, in the case of Ash'ariyyah, or the presence of jahl which cancels out ma'rifah in the case of the Jahmiyyah).

In addition, the Extremist Murji'ah would still consider one who committed acts of kufr to be a Believer, perfect in his Imaan, this being a natural extension of their viewpoint and definition of Imaan, that it is a single entity (either ma'rifah or tasdeeq in the heart).

Hence, there is a difference between

- a) what the Murji'ah say in that i) the act is not kufr at all, or ii) that this act is kufr because it indicates the absence of tasdeeq in the heart, or the absence of knowledge

¹³ And this is in reference to those acts that are al-kufr al-akbar, such as kicking the Qur'aan, reviling the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) and the likes.

(ma'rifah), since they limit kufr to takdheeb (rejection, the opposite to tasdeeq), and explain all acts of kufr to be in relation to takdheeb, and between:

- b) what Ahl us-Sunnah say that this act is kufr because it indicates what exists in the heart of kufr [at the time of commission of the act], **whether that might be** the kufr of takdheeb **or** juhood (rejection), **or** nifaaq (hypocrisy), **or** shakk (doubt), **or** istikbaar (pride and arrogance), **or** i'tiqaad (belief) **or all the various other types of kufr**. And this is from the perspective of illustrating the link between the external and the internal. And that what is kufr that expels from the religion on the outside, is also kufr on the inside. **And that what is in the heart is the asl, root, and what occurs on the tongue and limbs is a branch from that and follows on from it, and indicates it and is an evidence (daleel) to it.**

We can further see the understanding of Imaam al-Albaanee when he followed up Imaam an-Nawawi for omitting the words **“and your actions”** at the end of the hadeeth, “Indeed Allaah does not look at your bodies and nor at your faces, rather he looks at your hearts...”

Imaam al-Albani stated in his introduction to Riyaadh us-Saaliheen, “And Muslim and others added to this, in a narration, “and your actions”, and this (hadeeth) has been referenced fully in “Takhreej ul-Halaal wal-Haraam” (410). **And this addition is very important**, since many people understand this hadeeth in an erroneous manner without this addition. So when you command them with what the Legislation has ordered them such as growing the beard and not imitating the Kuffar and other such Sharee'ah obligations – **they answer you by saying that what depends is what is in the heart, and then they use this hadeeth to find evidence for their claim!** Without their knowing this correct addition (to the wording) which indicates that Allaah – the Blessed and Most High – looks also at their actions... **And the reality is that it is not possible to imagine the rectitude of the heart except by rectitude of the actions and nor rectitude of the actions, except by rectitude of the heart.**”¹⁴

After quoting the above Shaikh Ali Hasan then says¹⁵, “I say, this is a principle from the principles of Ahl us-Sunnah – on account of which they separate (themselves) from the Murji'ah – in the issue of Imaan – and in which they (the Murji'ah) went astray and deviated – and it is: **the reality of the fundamental relationship (at-talaazum) between the external, in terms of both speech and action, and the internal, in terms of assent (tasdeeq) and submission (idh'aan)** - and (in this affair did they, the Murji'ah) oppose their saying, both in wording and in true meaning!!

¹⁴ And then Shaikh al-Albaani follows up the statement of Ibn 'Allaan in his “Sharh” (4/406) when he said in explanation of this hadeeth, “...meaning, that He – the Most High – does not grant reward on account of the size of the body, or the beauty of the face, or the abundance of actions”! So Shaikh al-Albaani stated in the course of his criticism, “...and how can it be understood that Allaah will not look at action – just like (He will not look at) the bodies and faces – when it is the basis upon which a person enters into Paradise after Imaan.”

¹⁵ At-Ta'reef wat-Tanbi'ah (p.33)

And this matter is firmly established with Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah and amongst his sayings in this regard is, **"The basis of Imaan is in the heart, and this is the speech and action of the heart, and this is its affirmation (iqraar) and assent (tasdeeq) and its love (hubb) and compliance (inqiyaad). And whatever is in the heart then what it necessitates and requires must appear upon the limbs.** And when (a person) does not act upon what it necessitates and requires (of the external actions) **this indicates its absence or its weakness.** And for this reason, the outward actions are from the obligatory requirement of the Imaan of the heart and they are necessarily required by it, and they [the actions] constitute an affirmation (tasdeeq) of what is in the heart, **giving evidence (daleel) to it,** being a witness (shaahid) over it. And they [the actions] constitute a branch from the totality of Absolute Imaan, forming a part of it. **However, whatever is in the heart is the foundation (asl) of what emanates from the limbs.**"¹⁶ End of Shaikh Ali Hasan's words.

And it is from this perspective that Imaam al-Albaani centres his discussion of kufr, from this perspective and angle – and this has nothing to do with the beliefs of the Murji'ah – at all(!). It is from this perspective that Imaam al-Albaani considers those actions that expel from Islaam, to be from al-kufr al-i'tiqaadee.

This is where their confusion lies and this is where the Qutubiyah wallow in their misguidance and accuse, not just Imaam al-Albaani, but a major portion of Ahl us-Sunnah of being Extremist Murji'ah. In fact, their saying is a very evil saying indeed, because it necessitates that even Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibraaheem and Shaikh Saalih al-Fawzaan and Imaam Ibn Uthaimen are extremist Murji'ah.

In summary, the heart is the root and foundation of what occurs upon the limbs, since whatever is in the heart, then it must, by necessity be manifested upon the limbs. Hence, whenever an act of major kufr occurs upon the limbs, which is clearly major kufr as indicated by the texts of the Book and the Sunnah, then we know it to be kufr, both internally and externally. And it is for this reason, that Imaam al-Albaani has tied kufr to the heart – from this particular understanding – however, he has not negated the existence of actions that nullify Imaan. He has simply tied them to the kufr of the heart, from the point of view of the binding link between the actions and the heart, and that the heart is the root and foundation of what occurs on the limbs.

You must remember that the concern of the neo-Qutubites with this particular topic of Irjaa' and the Murji'ah is in order to establish that those who do not perform generalised, unrestricted takfir of the rulers, and who arrive at the judgement of takfir based upon the tafseel of the Salaf on the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, are Murji'ah, extreme in their Irjaa'.

To this end they utilise examples of actions of major kufr which do not require the likes of juhood (rejection) or istihlaal (making these acts lawful) or i'tiqaad (holding a belief in these statements or actions) – in order to extract principles which they then apply to the case of

¹⁶ Majmoo' ul-Fataawaa (7/644)

ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed. Connected to all of this is their attempt to portray ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed to be major kufr absolutely, and their attempt to nullify the statements of Ibn 'Abbaas, and their ta'weel of the many of the sayings of the Scholars.

So for example, they say a person who kicks the Qur'an knowingly and intently, then he is a kaafir, and we do not need to look at whether he made this act lawful or not (istihlaal). And this is true and correct, and we affirm it, istihlaal is not required in this case. Likewise, they say a person who uttered a statement of apostasy like mocking the religion or the Messenger (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) and the likes, then if he intended mockery with his statement and he knew this is unlawful, then he is a kaafir, regardless of whether he believed (in his heart) the words that he used to mock with or not, that is regardless of whether he held them to be true or not, since what is important in this case is that he merely intended mockery. So hence, here the condition of i'tiqaad (belief) is not necessary and nor does this person have to make mocking the religion lawful (istihlaal) for him to be judged a kaafir. And this is also true and we affirm it. And so on. **So all of this is true in the context of these actions.**

Then by establishing these principles around these types of examples the neo-Qutubites argue that any attempt to explain that these acts are kufr on account of the juhood (rejection) of the heart or istihlaal (making them lawful) or because of the beliefs held in the heart (i'tiqaad) and so on, that all of this is from the ways of the Extreme Murji'ah. **Till this point, this is all correct and true.**

Once this is established, they then come to their actual and real objective, which is to try and portray that ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed is major kufr absolutely, just like the acts mentioned above. Once they have tried to prove this (and we will refute their attempts in what is yet to come inshaa'llaah in the continuation of this discourse), they then state that anyone who tries to adhere to the tafseel of the Salaf in arriving at the judgement of takfir (i.e. by distinguishing between al-kufr al-i'tiqadee and al-kufr al-'amali on this particular issue) is an Extremist Murji' who has separated actions from Imaan. This is why you see them, alongside all of this trying to prove that the aathaar from Ibn Abbaas are weak, and that his real position is that the verses in al-Maa'idah actually indicate major kufr, absolutely, and that juhood (that is internal rejection of the heart) is on the limbs (absolutely) – all in order to flee from the tafseel of the Salaf in this regard. Beware O Sunni, this is their plot, and this is their aim and their objective, and if you understand this well, then you will have gained more insight into the saying of Shaikh Sa'd al-Hussain we quoted right at the very beginning.¹⁷

¹⁷ In his personal letter sent to Shaikh Abdul-Azeez Aal ash-Shaikh, Mufti of Saudi Arabia and head of the Permanent Committee, shortly after the issuing of the verdict concerning Shaikh Ali Hasan's two books on the subject of takfir and ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, Shaikh Sa'd al-Hussain stated, **"As for these brothers (the Jordanian Mashaayikh), I have known them for around fifteen years... and they by Allaah, are the best of those I know - I do not say in Jordan alone - but in the whole of Shaam, in terms of knowledge, manhaj (methodology) and da'wah (calling to Allaah)... As for this doubt of Irjaa' which Shaytaan has placed upon the tongues of their opponents, then they (the opponents) have only made this accusation against them because they are calling to the Manhaj of Nubuwwah (Prophetic Methodology), the manhaj that opposes the ways and methods of the Takfeeris (takfeeriyoon) such as the likes of Sayyid Qutb, Hasan at-**

Anyway going back to our earlier point, that the saying of the Neo-Qutubites is the extremity of evil since it necessitates that our Ulamaa, all of them, are Murji'ah, until even those whose words they themselves use, in order to justify their adulterated manhaj of Sayyid Qutb.

To illustrate. In Tahkeem ul-Qawaaneen Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibraaheem mentions the six types of **al-kufr al-i'tiqaadee (kufr in belief)**¹⁸ in relation to ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed:

- a) those who fall into this kufr on account of juhood (rejection)
- b) those who fall into this kufr by believing that some other judgement is better, more complete and comprehensive than that of Allaah and His Messenger
- c) those who fall into this kufr by believing that some other judgement is equivalent to the judgement of Allaah and His Messenger
- d) those who fall into this kufr by believing that it is permissible to judge by other than what Allaah has revealed.
- e) The setting up of law courts and institutions which judge in opposition to what Allaah has revealed, the basis of all of them being the secular laws of the disbelievers and the likes.
- f) What the bedouins fall into of judging by the habits and customs inherited from their forefathers and which are passed on from generation to generation.

Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibraaheem described them as “**kufr in belief**” at the beginning of his discussion of these six types, saying, “And it is impossible for Allaah, the Most Perfect, to call the one who judges by other than what Allaah has revealed a Kaafir and for him to not be a Kaafir – rather he is a Kaafir – **either being Kufr of action or Kufr of belief. And that which is reported by Ibn ‘Abbaas (radiallaahu anhumaa) by way of Taawoos and others in explanation of this aayah, shows that the ruler by other than what Allaah has revealed is a**

Turaabi and others amongst the biased partisans and political activists..” (Refer to “Rihlati Ilaa Bilaad ul-Haramayn”)

¹⁸ Reflect carefully, here and note how the Shaikh has included the forms of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, which occur on the limbs and which he considers to expel from the religion to be **al-kufr al-i'tiqaadee(!!!)**.

Kaafir, either with the kufr of belief¹⁹, which takes him outside the religion - or with the kufr of action, which does not take him outside the religion.²⁰

And also reflect on the discussion that took place with Shaikh Saalih al-Fawzaan concerning some of his words related to ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed (refer to MNJ050014 for the full discussion):

Questioner: “Someone has understood from your words in Kitaab ut-Tawheed, which are from your comments, with regards to the issue of al-Haakimiyyah and ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed. So they have understood from them that [by the act alone] you perform specific takfir of a specific ruler who does not judge by what Allaah has revealed. And then they applied (what they understood from your words) to the rulers of the Gulf states.

Shaikh al-Fawzan: [Laughs]... is it due to hawaa (desire)?... the words are clear, there is no ambiguity in them, the words are clear. The distinction (tafsil) that is mentioned (i.e. previously in the beginning of the chapter) relates to them. And it was then said after that that the one who banishes the Shari’ah entirely and puts another law in its place, that this indicates (**daleel**) that he views the [secular] law to be better than the Sharee’ah, **and whoever holds this opinion, he is the one who is a kaafir [emphasis given]**²¹. This is in the

¹⁹ Reflect carefully here, and you will note that Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem rahimahullaah, indeed adheres to the tafseel on the issue of takfir of the one who does not judge by what Allaah has revealed. Unfortunately, this part of the quotation was clipped by the author of the “Decisive Refutation”, and we will illustrate this and many other of his tragedies in the continuation of this series inshaa’llallah. Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie preached piety to others, but does not enact it himself...

Also Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem has used this term, al-kufr al-i’tiqadee to mean al-kufr al-akbar, and this is also the terminological usage of Imaam al-Albaani, until even for those actions that occur on the limbs and which expel from Islaam. For more detail on the saying of Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem here, refer to GRV070006 (The Difference Between the Shaikhs of the Salafi Da’wah and the Qutubiyyah).

²⁰ It is interesting to note that the neo-Khawaarij, Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah, attempt to discredit the statements of Ibn ‘Abbaas in which he makes tafseer of the verse in al-Maa’idah in that it is kufr less than kufr (i.e. major kufr), and here we have Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem, whose words they quote, affirming the exact opposite, namely he affirms that this is indeed Ibn ‘Abbaas’s explanation.

AN AMAZING BENEFIT: Not only that, this saying of Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem is a decisive refutation of the thesis of the author of the “Decisive Refutation”. Firstly, the Shaikh has categorised kufr here into kufr of action and kufr of belief. Secondly, those **actions** which he considers to expel from Islaam (which are types e) and f) in the list of the 6 manifestations of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed), then he did not include that within the kufr of action (al-kufr a-‘amali), rather he included it within the kufr of belief (al-kufr al-i’tiqadee). Now, when we come to Part 3 in our discourse and look at the actual discussion that the author of the “Decisive Refutation” has relied upon in order to ascribe Irjaa to Imaam al-Albaani, then it is necessitated upon him that he also ascribe this Irjaa’ to Shaikh Muhammad bin Ibraaheem Aal ash-Shaikh. It is binding upon him to do that and announce that. Otherwise, his whole argument is nullified, and his contradiction made apparently clear walhamdulillah. Pay careful attention to this point O Sunni, and remember it when we come to read the comments that the sinful forelock of Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie made upon Shaikh al-Albaani’s words.

²¹ Reflect carefully here for Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan has stated that the outward action is an indication of the beliefs that the heart holds, and that whoever holds the likes these beliefs is a Kaafir. So the asl, foundation of

same book itself... however they only take [from the book] according to their own understanding of it and what is of benefit to them, yet they abandon the rest of the words. **If they had read the words from the beginning, the matter would have become clear [to them].**

Questioner: And the statement of Shaikh Muhammad Ibn Ibraheem is [understood] in the same way?

Shaikh al-Fawzan: Yes, it is the same. His words mean that the one who abolishes the Shari'ah and puts in its place another law, **then this indicates (daleel) that he considers this law to be better than the Sharee'ah²². And [subsequently] whoever considers this law to be better than the Sharee'ah, then such a one is a kaafir in the view of everybody, there is no doubt in this.** End of quote.

And also reflect on what has been stated by Imaam Ibn Uthaimen (on 22/03/1420H):

“As for what is connected to [the issue of] ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, then it is, as occurs in the Mighty Book, divided into three types: that which is kufr (disbelief), that which is dhlum (oppression) and that which is fisq (sinfulness) – all in accordance with the various reasons upon which this judgement is made:

1. So if a person judges by other than what Allaah has revealed due to following his desires, alongside his knowledge that the truth lies in what Allaah has decreed, then such a one does not disbelieve, however he is either a faasiq (sinner) or a dhaalim (oppressor).
2. **Or when he legislates (yusharri'u) a general ruling (hukman 'aamman) which the Ummah [adopts and] traverses upon, and he considers this to be of benefit (maslahah), and he is caught up in [confusion about it], then he does not disbelieve either,** because many of the rulers have ignorance of the knowledge of the Sharee'ah and one who does not know the Sharee'ah ruling is often connected to them (i.e. by their side) and they (the rulers) consider such a one to be a great scholar, and opposition [to the Sharee'ah] occurs as a result of all of this.
3. **And if he knows the legislation (Shar') however he judges by this [legislation] or he legislates this [law] and then makes it a code of law (dustoor) to be followed by the**

the kufr was in the beliefs, and as for the actions, they are indicators of what the heart contains. It is important to clarify a matter here, that this applies in the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah revealed, and is not a general principle that can be applied to other actions and other contexts absolutely. Hence, according to the neo-Qutubiyyah, Khaarijiyah Asriyyah who attempt to pass of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed as major kufr, absolutely, without tafseel, then Shaikh Saalih al-Fawzaan is a Murji' extreme in his Irjaa'.

²² That is the external act gives daleel (evidence) that a belief of kufr is being held in the heart. And again we re-iterate that this explanation is unique to the situation of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed and does not apply to those other actions which as actions, negate Imaan from every single aspect, such as mocking the religion, kicking the Qur'aan and so on.

people, believing (ya'taqid) that he is an oppressor (dhaalim) in all of that and that the truth is what has come in the Book and the Sunnah, then we are not able to make takfir of this one.¹

4. But we make takfeer of:

- i) the one who holds that the a legislation other than Allaah's is more appropriate for the people to be upon
- ii) or the one who believes that this legislation is equivalent to the legislation of Allaah, the Mighty and Majestic²³

It is this one who is a disbeliever **because he is a mukhaddhib (makes takdheeb)**²⁴ of the saying of Allaah, the Blessed and Almighty, **"Is not Allaah the Best of all Judges?"** and also His saying, **"Is it the judgement of Jaahiliyyah they seek. And who is a better judge than Allaah for a people of sure (faith)?"**. End of quote from Shaikh Ibn Uthaimeen.

Notice, how in all of the above, the Shaikhs have explained that the act of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed (in the particular form and context that occurs in their statements) is major kufr because of what it indicates of the underlying beliefs or actions in the heart, whether it is takdheeb, or whether it is i'tiqaad, that is considering other than the law of Allaah to be better, or equal to it and so on.

So according to the neo-Kharijites, all of our Ulamaa are Extremist Murji'ah, until even those whose words they quote in order to justify their own adulterated Qutubi manhaj, such as Shaikh Muhammad Ibn Ibraaheem, and Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan. Until even Imaam ash-Shanqeetee, who said, "And by this it is known that the halaal (lawful) is what Allaah has declared lawful and the haraam (unlawful) is what Allaah has declared unlawful, and the deen (religion) is what has been legislated by Allaah. Therefore, every legislation (tashree') from other than Him is falsehood, and acting upon it – **instead of (badala) the legislation of Allaah, for the one who believes that it is equivalent to it, or better than it** – is clear, manifest kufr, there being no doubt in it." (Adwaa ul-Bayaan 7/162).

So we challenge Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie, exclaim and shout with the might of your tongue and pen, that Shaikh Ibn Ibraaheem, Shaikh Salih al-Fawzaan and many others are Extremist Murji'ah(!). By Allah, based upon these same Qutubi principles, even Imaam ash-

²³ And in both of these cases, it is irrelevant whether he actually judges by this other legislation or not(!)

²⁴ And here the Shaikh has indicated the cause of kufr(!). Indeed we challenge the author of the "Decisive Refutation" to charge Imaam Ibn Uthaimeen with the Extreme Extremist Irjaa' of Jahm Ibn Safwaan and his sect(!). The point here is that if in a specific instance someone explains the cause of kufr to be what is in the heart of takdheeb (rejection), then that does not mean that that person has restricted kufr in all cases to be what is in the heart of takdheeb. Rather, we need to look at other statements of this person, to see his stance more clearly. And this is the mistake that the Qutubiyyah have fallen into. They have taken from Imaam al-Albaani's words that which will allow them to build their thesis and their accusation, while fleeing from taking into consideration his other statements. And their sole concern and occupation in all of this is to abandon the tafseel of the Salaf on the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, and accuse anyone who holds on to it to be upon Extremist Irjaa'.

Shanqeetee has fallen into Irjaa', because he has specified, belief (I'tiqaad) for the kufr of the one who in his actions, rules by secular laws, in replacement of Sharee'ah laws(!!).

In essence, the neo-Qutubiyyah, Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah have a purpose and agenda behind this whole issue of Irjaa' - due to their affectation to Innovation and the whisperings of the souls, and coupled with their ignorance of the reality of Irjaa' and their affectation to the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb, have wandered in their misguidance, and refuge is from Allaah.

Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen said: **"Whoever accused Shaikh al-Albaanee of Irjaa' has erred. Either he is one who does not know al-Albaanee or he is one who does not know Irjaa'.** Al-Albaanee is a man from Ahl us-Sunnah – may Allaah have mercy upon him –, a defender of it, an Imaam in Hadeeth. We do not know of anyone who has surpassed him in our time. However, some people – and we ask Allaah's pardon – **have jealousy in their hearts.** For when [one of them] sees that a person has been met with acceptance [by the people], he begins to find fault with him on account of something, just like the hypocrites, those who used to defame those believers who would give freely in charity – and those [i.e. hypocrites] who would find nothing but the striving of [the believers]. So they would defame the one who would give charity in abundance, and also the poor person who would give charity! We know the man from his books – may Allaah have mercy upon him – and I know him from sitting with him on occasions. He is Salafi in aqeedah, of sound manhaj. **However some people desire to perform takfeer of the servants of Allaah on account of something that Allaah did not perform takfeer of them.** Then they claim that whoever opposes them in this takfeer is a Murji' – a lie, slander, and mighty fabrication. **Therefore, do not listen to this saying regardless of whomever it comes from!"** (Cassette: Makaalamaat Ma'a Mashaayikh ad-Da'wah as-Salafiyyah (Part 4) Dated 12/6/2000CE).

Rather they have utilised all this sophistry, to focus on only one thing – Takfir and Haakimiyyah.

PART 2: SHAIKH KHALID AL-ANBARI ON THE CREED OF AL-ALBAANI

The Shaikh was asked, "Some people accuse the Shaikh of the Sunnah, Muhammad Naasir ud-Deen al-Albaani (rahimahullaah) or Ijraa', and they do so quite frequently. They say that he put certain conditions for the act of revilement (sabb) of the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) for example, those that the Scholars of the Sunnah did not specify, such as Istihlaal and the likes. And they also refer to so expressions in which the Shaikh mentions that revilement can occur from a person while he is undmindful (ghaflah), or ignorant (jahl), or on account of bad upbringing, and that such a person should be excused, and other such expressions. So they deduced from all of this that the Shaikh requires Istihlaal as a condition and they say that this is the way of the Jahmiyyah. So what is your reply to this saying?"

Answer: All praise is due to Allaah... to proceed... As for the answer that our brother, the Shaikh, Abdul-Kareem, has presented, then our Shaikh al-Albaani (rahimahullaah) is upon the aqeedah of Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah and the Salaf us-Saalih on the issues of Imaan and Takfir, except that some people who do not give the estimation that the Shaikh truly deserves, and who stir in the murky waters (of tribulation), they take some expressions (of the Shaikh) in which there is a generalisation (ambiguity), and then they build upon this (or infer from it) something that the Shaikh does not actually intend (with his words).

For Shaikh al-Albaani (rahimahullaah) believes that Imaan is speech and action. And by speech I mean the speech of the heart and tongue, and by action I mean the action of the heart and the limbs. And the Shaikh (rahimahullaah) follows in the way of Ahl us-Sunnah in their belief that Imaan increases and decreases and that people can excel over each other with respect to it. This is in a general overview on the issues of Imaan.

As for the issues pertaining to takfir, then Shaikh al-Albaani (rahimahullaah) holds that it is of six types and not just one type, which the Murji'ah believe. The Shaikh holds that it is of six types: the kufr of takdhib (repudiation), juhood (wilful rejection), ibaa' and istikbaar (pride and arrogance), 'inaad (stubborn resistance), shakk (doubt) and nifaaq (hypocrisy). And this will become clear to the one who listens to the recorded discussion that took place between myself and the Shaikh (rahimahullaah) in the cassette titled "At-Tahreer Fi Masaa'il it-Takfir". It becomes clear to the one who listens to this tape that the Shaikh holds that kufr occurs by belief, speech and action...

So kufr occurs by belief such as holding that Allaah the Mighty and Majestic has a partner, or such as making permissible the forbidden things such as fornication and intoxicants. It also occurs by speech such as reviling Allaah the Mighty and Majestic and His Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) or mocking the Signs of Allaah and His Messengers and other such things.

Rather, the Shaikh makes takfir by these matters in absolute terms (mutlaqan), that is he makes takfir of the one who reviles or mocks regardless of whether he made istihlaal of his action or not.

The Shaikh follows Ahl us-Sunnah in takfir by actions. So the Shaikh makes takfir of the one who prostrates to an idol, and the one who throws the Qur'aan into dirt, and the one who fights the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) and he holds that actions that expel from Islaam are of two types. The first are those actions which do not deserve except takfir, such as fighting the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam), or throwing the Qur'aan into the dirt. And the second type are those actions that can represent kufr or other than kufr, such as the one who fights against a Muslim, or the one who has intercourse with a woman through her anus, or the one who goes to a sorcerer and those other actions which do not expel from Islaam except when the one who falls into them makes Istihlaal.

These are the detailed viewpoints (tafseelaat) of the Shaikh in the issues of Imaan and Takfir and the Shaikh himself has refuted the Murji'ah in more than one place and in more than one book.

Hence, the usool (principles) of the Shaikh are in agreement with what Ahl us-Sunnah wal-Jamaa'ah are upon. So where is the Irjaa'. There is no Irjaa' except in the minds of those who want to make al-Albaani fall down, not just because of his person, but because of the Manhaj he is upon (that of Tasfiyah and Tarbiyah upon the Manhaj of Nubuwwah)...." End of quote.²⁵

And what Shaikh Khalid al-'Anbari has stated is indeed the truth, for those amongst the now-Qutubites, who are donning the gown of Salafiyyah, while huddling the undergarments of Qutubiyyah and Khaarijiyyah, leave aside what is clear from the Shaikh's position, in that he does not restrict takfir to takdheeb alone, and that he performs takfir on account of actions as well, and that he considers kufr to be of six types (and not just takdheeb!!), and they instead focus on the statements which were made by the Shaikh, which contain ambiguity, some generalisations, and then infer from them matters, that the Shaikh himself negates in other places. However, their deceit and treachery (that is the neo-Qutubic pseudo-intellectuals, the seekers of fame and glory, and never will they attain it) becomes manifest when they abandon the muhkamaat (the clear positions) and the ta'seelaat (the laying down of the principles) of the Shaikh and instead go to the shubuhaat (ambiguous), and those which they can twist and take out of context in order to attain their objectives.

And indeed what makes the Shaikhs position clear is his discussion with Shaikh Abdullaah al-Ubaylaan in early 1999 when he clarified his position on takfir and apostasy. You can read it in the article MSC060006 – and indeed this is a hujjah against every sinful, lying, deceiving, treacherous Qutubi forelock...

²⁵ From the tape, "Questions and Answers in Somalia on the Issue of Irjaa'."

PART 3: THE CREED OF IMAAM AL-ALBAANI AS NARRATED BY HIS STUDENTS

As we said right at the beginning, when we wish to understand the creed of an Imaam, and some obscurity or misunderstanding has appeared in this regard, then we turn to those who are nearest to him, who know his words and statements, and are familiar with his teachings (as opposed to other than them, those who find two cassette recordings, and rejoice, thinking they have proved the Shaikh is upon the Irjaa' of Jahm Ibn Safwaan). Shaikh Alee Hasan wrote, in response to some questions posed to him concerning his stance on the issues of Kufr:

“All praise is for Allaah, and may Allaah extol and send blessings of peace upon Allaah's Messenger, and upon his true followers, his Companions, and those who have love and allegiance to him. To proceed:

Then my brother Ismaa'eel al-'Umaree, may Allaah grant him correctness, showed me the text of some answers I had given to some questions relating to knowledge and 'aqeedah which a brother asked me. Then just for clarification I would like to mention that I did not previously know al-Muwahhid who asked the questions. Rather one of the brothers having love for us connected me to him via the telephone (from his house) in Makkah al-Mukarramah, may Allaah grant him increase from His Bounty.

Then I was surprised to see the questions and the answers, in abridged form, on the Internet, carrying the name, 'al-Muwahhid.' However I was pleased from another angle because I, 'am also his brother 'al-Muwahhid.' This along with the fact that the aforementioned brother, may Allaah grant him increase in attainment of what is correct, had sought permission from me to put the answers on the Internet, even though he did not mention that title, and I did not ask him about it!!

So when I saw the abridgement of my answers I found that it was generally a good abridgement, so may Allaah reward the questioner with good!

However, it appeared to me that I should add a note to a word occurring in some of his questions, and it is his saying, “Why do we not say that a saying or an action is Kufr because of the fact that the authentic texts indicate that it is Kufr?”

So I say here: **because the Kufr that is a negation of eemaan from every angle includes the addition of a further clarification that requires awareness of the true reality of the text with regard to its clear indication of its being [either] this type of Kufr [which expels from Islaam] or that type [which does not expel from Islaam] ...**

Whereas if we were to say, ‘This is Kufr because of the fact that the authentic texts indicate that it is Kufr’, **then this (statement) will include different kinds and types of Kufr:** the Kufr of action and of speech which does not take a person outside the Religion and that about whose verdict the Imaams of the Sunnah differ, such as swearing by other than Allaah, fighting against a Muslim, going to soothsayers ..., and so on, **which are to be distinguished**

from that which is established to be Kufr, because of the fact that the authentic texts indicate that it is Kufr.

So these affairs, even though they are Kufr, yet they are not from, 'the Kufr that is a negation of Eemaan from every single angle', which is in itself Major Kufr (al-Kufr al-Akbar).

As for the brother's question, afterwards, concerning these matters which cause a person to become an Unbeliever (those matters which negate Eemaan from every angle), 'Is it a condition for the person's becoming an Unbeliever that he holds these things to be permissible (al-Istihlaal)?'

Then the reply is: **the presence of the pre-conditions (wujood ash-shuroot) and absence of the preventing factors with regard to those type of things that cause a person to become an Unbeliever is itself sufficient for istihlaal (the person's holding them to be permissible) not being taken into consideration as a condition for declaring the one who is guilty of them to be an Unbeliever, conclusively. This is because of their particular and distinguishing characteristics of being Kufr that negates Eemaan from every aspect ...**

Whereas, holding prohibited things to be permissible (al-Istihlaal), wilful rejection (al-Juhood), outright denial (al-Inkaar), repudiation (at-Takdheeb) (and other types of Kufr) are a condition necessary for takfeer (declaration of the persons being an Unbeliever) of one who commits Kufr of speech or action, which is not counted as being a negation of Eemaan from every angle ...

So this is the way in which the affair is to be determined, with the speech of the Imaams of knowledge, **not with the deficient wordings with which people upon their deluded whims err, and which lead people off on flights of fancy ...**

I say all of this, yet again, emphasising the fact that this is what we have held as our belief for many years, and it is exactly what we took from our Shaikh, rahimahullaah, and from his brothers – the scholars. So whoever has understood something about us, different to this, then let him accuse himself before accusing us, and let him check his own understanding before slandering us, and in particular those who, 'are unable to ask pertinent questions and who do not understand the words'. And Allaah is the one who grants success to what is correct and straight.

27th April 2000

And by Allaah, this is the state and condition of Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie, an unknown person, living in Canada, who has tasked himself to refute the Imaam of the Sunnah – based upon his own faulty understanding, his twisting of the words and his lack of integrity – and from Allaah is the refuge.

PART 4: UNDERSTANDING THE DISCUSSION

In quoting the discussion, we will add comments where relevant and explain the context as we go along. In addition we will outline in the footnotes, the errors of the author of the “Decisive Refutation” and his ignorance and his misrepresenting the words of Imaam al-Albaani.

Questioner: “Concerning the *Ijmaa’* that Ibn Katheer mentioned in “*Al-Bidaaya Wa-Nihaaya*,” that whoever rules with “*Al-Yasaaq*” (the book put together by the Tartars who added their own *Hukm* to the *Sharee’ah* as well as some of the laws of the People of the Book) that he is a *Kafir* by *Ijmaa’* of the *Muslimeen*, and also, O our *Shaykh* just like Muhammad bin Abdul-Wahhab says, “The *Tawagheet* (plural of *Taghuut*) are five...” and from them, “...The unjust ruler that changes the laws of Allaah...” and he mentioned the one who rules by other than what Allaah revealed. And like we know that disbelief in the *Taghuut* is the second pillar of *Tawheed*, because Allaah *az’awajaal* said, “Whoever disbelieves in the *Taghuut* and believes in Allaah, then he has grasped the firm hand-hold...” (Surat *Al-Baqarah*, 256) ...so the disbelief in the *Taghuut* is the second pillar from the pillars of *Eemaan*. So if we say that the *Ijmaa’* has been narrated about the *Kufr* of the one who changes the laws of Allaah, *az’awajaal*, then I must establish this *Aqeedah* and establish the *Islaamic* state – as we have heard from you – inside my heart. So I must not believe this in my heart, especially when the *Ulamaa’* of the *Muslimeen* ... more than one ‘*Alaam* ... have narrated the *Ijmaa’* of the *Kufr* of the ruler who changes (the *Hukm*) and from them was Mah’mood Shakir and ‘Umar Al-Ashaar and about six *Ulamaa’* have narrated the *Ijmaa’* on this point.”

[Comments]: The discussion begins with the questioner attempting to pass off ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed to be major kufr absolutely, and changing the laws of Allaah to be major kufr. Though, this is not the place for a discussion of this here, the reader is referred to MNJ050018 on the issue replacement (tabdeel) of the religion for more clarification and also to GRV070006 which also adds more clarity. But the point here is that it is important to note the context of the discussion. Shaikh al-Albaani, like Imaam Ibn Baaz, and like Imaam Ibn Uthaimeen, does not hold that a person who falls into what the questioner is describing of ruling by other than what Allaah reveals, (meaning that he rules by the secular laws instead of the *Sharee’ah* laws) is major kufr. Rather, he holds it to be the minor kufr, or the kufr of action (al-kufr al-‘amali), which in the view of the Shaikh represents those actions which do not, in themselves, negate Imaan from every aspect. It is important to remember this, for this is the context of the discussion.[/Comments].

Answer from the Shaykh: “You...may Allaah bless you...have you paid attention previously and just now during this sitting, that the *Kufr* is an action of the heart and not an action of the body? Did you pay attention to this or not?!”

[Comments]: The Shaikh here is speaking from the angle that is outlined in some of the quotations that we outlined in Part 1, in which the meaning afforded is that the heart is the *asl* (basis, foundation), and the actions follow on from that, being a branch of it, giving *daleel* (evidence) to it (such as Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah). And as for the “action of the body” being alluded to by the Shaikh, then because the context of the question is ruling

by other than what Allaah has revealed, which the Shaikh considers to be the kufr of action to begin with, and which he does not consider to be the kufr that expels from the religion unless it is accompanied with juhood, istihlaal, i'tiqaad and the likes, then what the Shaikh intends is what he understands to be al-kufr al-'amali, or what is considered to be al-kufr al-asghar, and what will give the clearest of evidences to this is what follows below when the Shaikh gives actual examples of the types of actions he is talking about. [/Comments].

Questioner: "We do not agree with this."

Answer from the Shaykh: "This is where the problems arise. What is the *Kufr*? What does 'disbelieved' mean linguistically and in the terminology of the *Sharee'ah*?"

Questioner: "The *Kufr* in the language means the rejection but in the terminology of the *Sharee'ah*, the *Ulamaa'* have broken it down into *Kufr Al-'Atiqaadee* and *Kufr Al-'Amilee* or *Kufr Akbaar* and *Kufr Asgaar*. And the *Kufr Al-Akbaar*, they said, is what takes you outside the *Milla*. So the *Kufr Al-Asgaar*..."

Answer from the Shaykh: "It doesn't matter...may Allaah bless you...we do not want lectures right now! We want understanding – questions and answers. Just now you said that there is *Kufr 'Amilee* and *Kufr 'Atiqaadee*. Do you mean what you say? Fine. The *Kufr 'Amilee*...does the one who commits it disbelieve?"

Questioner: "Yes, if it takes you out of the *Milla*...if it is *Kufr Akbaar* because the *Kufr 'Amilee* – from it is *Kufr Akbaar* and *Kufr Asgaar*."

[Comments]: Here one can clearly understand the problem. Imaam al-Albaani is asking the questioner about al-kufr al-'amali, and by which he means those actions that occur on the limbs, which in themselves are not major kufr (unlike kicking the Qur'an, reviling the Messenger etc.), so he is asking the questioner whether this is kufr that expels from the religion or not. And the argument of the Shaikh is linked to the context of the discussion which is that of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed – which can be both kufr of action (that does not negate Imaan) and kufr of belief (that does negate Imaan) based upon the tafseel of the Salaf. And the questioner is trying to show that amongst the actions are those that negate Imaan totally. However, he is not answering the question of the Shaikh, the context of which is the actions that do not negate Imaan totally, and this is most likely because he is not aware of the intent of the Shaikh and vice versa. [/Comments].

Answer from the Shaykh: "*Ya Akhee*...may Allaah bless you. I just said a word. We do not want to give lectures. Right now we want to understand a word and what it encompasses. **We agree that there is *Kufr 'Amilee* and *Kufr 'Atiqaadee*.** So I asked you, does the *Kufr 'Amilee* take the one who commits it outside the *Milla*? The answer: Either you say yes or you say no. Then there is no problem with explanations if the matter requires it."

[Comments]: Here again, the Shaikh is intending one thing and the questioner (from his previous statement) is intending something else. The Shaikh says here that he agrees that there is *kufr 'amalee* and *kufr i'tiqaadee* (and bear in mind the understanding of the Shaikh

that he considers the actions which negate Imaan, like kicking the Qur'aan, mocking the religion etc., to be from kufr i'tiqaadee). The Shaikh then asks for a clear answer concerning the kufr 'amali, by which he clearly intends those actions that do not negate Imaan. Also remember Shaikh Al-Albaani, in what we have discussed in Part 1 quoted the very words of Ibn al-Qayyim in his Kitaab us-Salaat, the words in which there is a distinction between the kufr of action that negates Imaan and the kufr of action that does not negate Imaan.²⁶ [/Comments].

Questioner: "Here, an explanation is required."

Answer from the Shaykh: "Say: Is the *Kufr 'Amilee* equal to *Ridah* (apostasy) or not?!"

Questioner: "I will not answer except with an explanation."²⁷

Answer from the Shaykh: "*Subhaan-Allaah!* Is *Kufr Al-'Atiqaadee* equal to the *Kufr* of *Ridah*?!"

Questioner: "Yes."

[Comments]: Again, the Shaikh is attempting to get the same answer out of the questioner. Perhaps there is some misunderstanding on behalf of both parties. The Shaikh is clearly talking about those actions that do not negate Imaan from every aspect (such as fighting a Muslim etc., which have been given the label of "kufr" but do not expel from Islaam). Whereas the questioner is attempting to affirm that some actions negate Imaan totally. However, the Shaikh considers such actions to be al-kufr al-i'tiqaadee, based upon his categorisation and understanding as outlined in Part 1. This is why the Shaikh said to him,

²⁶ THE QUTUBI UNDERSTANDING [1]

As for the author of the "Decisive Refutation" then his comments on the last words of Imaam al-Albaani were: **"Do you see how the influence of Irjaa' has entered these words, Akhee? Read further and it becomes more obvious."**

And he obviously has not even understood the way of thinking of Imaam al-Albaani, the context of his questions, and the types of action he is actually referring to. And the intent of Imaam al-Albaani actually becomes clearer in what comes later in his words. Yet Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie did not do justice at all, as we shall see.

²⁷ THE QUTUBI UNDERSTANDING [2]

As for the author of the "Decisive Refutation" then his comments here were, **"This was the right thing to say here. Because, either he has to say that all forms of Kufr of the limbs nullify all the Eemaan in the heart or none of them do. And both of these statements would be incorrect."**

And he still has not understood the context of the discussion and the context of Imaam al-Albaani's questioning. The Shaikh is talking about those actions which do not negate Imaan, based upon his understanding of kufr, as outlined in Part 1, namely that he groups the beliefs, statements and actions that expel from Islaam under al-kufr al-i'tiqaadee and the actions that do not expel from Islaam as al-kufr al-'amali. Yet Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie did not do justice at all... and did not consider the whole context of the discussion.

“*Subhaan-Allaah! Is Kufr Al-‘Atiqaadee* equal to the *Kufr of Riddah?*”²⁸ So the Shaikh, knowing that the context of the questioner’s argument is the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, which to him is not major kufr, but minor kufr to begin with (unless it is accompanied with the beliefs of the heart that necessitate kufr) is still pressing the questioner to affirm whether the actions of the limbs (that do not negate Imaan) are equivalent to the kufr of apostasy. And what seems apparent is that they both have a misunderstanding about each others intent in this part of the discussion. And what fuels this misunderstanding is that they are both coming from two separate perspectives. Imaam al-Albaani considers the acts of kufr that negate Imaan to be synonymous with al-kufr al-i’tiqaadee, and the questioner does not understand or appreciate this (just like the author of the “Decisive Refutation!!). Imaam al-Albaani is trying to refute the questioner’s assertion that ruling by other than what Allaah has ruled is kufr akbar, absolutely, without tafseel, and so from this perspective he is pressing him to make clear whether he considers the kufr of action (that does not negate Imaan) to actually negate Imaan. All of this will be crystal clear when see what occurs later on in the discussion.[/Comments].

Answer from the Shaykh: “Fine. Why did you not seek to explain that?”

Questioner: “Because this is agreed upon. But the *Kufr ‘Amilee* is an issue of difference between the *Murji’ah* and *Ahl us-Sunnah*.”

²⁸ And the Shaikh considers the kufr of belief to be synonymous with the kufr of riddah (apostasy), and this is why he often explains **certain actions** to be kufr of riddah or kufr of belief. He said, “**And amongst the actions are those on account of which a person actually disbelieves with the kufr of belief (I’tiqaadiyy) (i.e. apostatises).** This is because such actions show his disbelief with certainty and decisiveness in the sense that when a person commits them, it is as if he is actually expressing his disbelief with his tongue, such as the one who kicks the Qur’an while he knows it is the Qur’an and intending to kick it, deliberately...” Refer to Fitnah of Takfir (p.72, 1st edition, 1417H).

The Shaikh was also asked: “Some of the narrations have come from some of the Imaams, and from some of the companions, such as, Khaalid Ibn al-Waleed, and some of the Imaams, such as, Imaam Ahmad about the Kufr of the one who insults Allah or the Messenger, and they considered it to be the Kufr of Riddah (apostasy). So is this in absolute terms? We hope for benefit”.

The Shaikh replied: “We do not see this in absolute terms, for the insult or curse may result due to Jahl (ignorance) or bad upbringing, or it may occur due to one being unmindful. And lastly, it may also occur due to intent and knowledge, and if it occurs in this way, **due to intent and knowledge, then it is Riddah (apostasy) in which there is no ambiguity.** But if it happens in a case from other cases to which I pointed, then taking care in abstaining from Takfeer is more important Islaamicaly than rushing towards Takfeer” (Cassette: al-Kufr Kufraan).”

So here Shaikh al-Albaani affirms that reviling the Messenger is the kufr of Riddah, when the conditions of takfir are present, which are intent (qasd) and knowledge (‘ilm).

And likewise, in his discussion with Shaikh Abdullaah al-Ubaylaan the Shaikh said about the one who treads upon the Qur’aan, “**So if he knew that it was the Noble Qur’aan and was intending disrespect to it, then his Kufr is the Unbelief of Apostacy (Riddah)**”. (refer to MSC060006, The Creed of Imaam al-Albaani on Takfir and Apostacy). So here it is the kufr of Riddah and earlier the Shaikh described the same act as the kufr of belief (al-kufr al-i’tiqaadee), yet it is an act of the limbs.

Answer from the Shaykh: “Fine. *Kufr Al-'Amilee*...does it have a tie with the *Kufr Al-'Atiqaadee*, which you have said is *Ridah*, or does not?”

Questioner: “Yes.”²⁹

Answer from the Shaykh: Then return to *Kufr 'Atiqaadee*...may Allaah bless you. The *Kufr 'Amilee*, as it appears to me...and do not be angry with me because I am trying to make this saying light...has not been made clear to you the difference between *Kufr 'Atiqaadee* and *Kufr 'Amilee*, so that it would be clear to you the fruits of the differences between *Kufr Al-'Atiqaadee* and the *Kufr Al-'Amilee*? The *Kufr Al-'Amilee* is an action that is committed by a Muslim, which is from the actions of the *Kuffar*. But this action, which is committed by the Muslim is like that action, which is committed by the *Kuffar* from one point of view...the point of view that it is an action. But it is different from another point of view because that action is committed by the *Kafir* while having *Kufr 'Atiqaadee*. But this Muslim...and here the fruits will be clarified between the difference of the two *Kufr*...this Muslim – if he commits *Kufr Al-'Amilee* and adds to that *Kufr 'Atiqaadee*, like the *Kufr of the Kafir*...then it is *Kufr Ridah* with no difference in that.

[Comments]: And here the Shaikh has spoken in perfect agreement with Ahl us-Sunnah that they do not declare a person to be a disbeliever by the commission of a sin (that is not al-kufr al-akbar), so long as he does not make it lawful, or accompany it with something that necessities major kufr. The Shaikh's context is clearly those actions that are actions of minor kufr, as he will soon explain. But as for Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie, then what did he understand from this, and how did he treat the words of the Shaikh. Read this footnote³⁰.[/Comments]

²⁹ THE SHALLOW QUTUBI UNDERSTANDING [3]

The author of the “Decisive Refutation” commented at this point: **“Now I ask you, Akhee, to focus upon the next statements of the Shaykh and recall our discussion on the Usul of Kufr and Eemaan of the Murji'ah and how these Usul affected the rules of Takfeer for them.”**

And we say, O Sunni, focus upon the next set of statements of Imaam al-Albaani and note how he is still talking about the kufr 'amali which does not negate Imaan totally and note how he later gives examples of this, **in the very same breath**(!!), and note how Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie has an extremely poor understanding, has twisted the direction and import of the whole passage and has indeed ascribed to Shaikh al-Albaani meanings and imports he does not even intend.

³⁰ THE SHALLOW QUTUBI UNDERSTANDING [4]

The author of the “Decisive Refutation” commented at this point: **“This is wrong and this is Irjaa' and not the Aqeedah of Ahl us-Sunnah Wal-Jamaa'h. What this basically implies, is that a person who prostrates to an idol – even when it has been confirmed that this person knew he was prostrating to an idol and that he knew this form of worship is only to be directed towards Allaah, has not disbelieved by this action because this was only Kufr 'Amilee. And by extension, Takfeer could not be made to him until he could confirm that this act of Kufr 'Amilee had been joined with Kufr 'Atiqaadee in the heart. And no one from Ahl us-Sunnah has ever said such a thing.”**

May Allaah kill this wicked and blind desire!!!! And is the Shaikh talking about prostrating to an idol, or kicking the Qur'an and the likes of these things?? By Allaah this is a wicked lie and a wicked slander and a wicked fabrication upon the Shaikh and wicked form of twisting his words and making them carry meanings that they do not even carry....Subhaanallaah, the Shaikh is talking about al-kufr al-'amali that does not negate

“...(the *Shaykh* continues) But if nothing has been committed from him to indicate that the *Kufr Al-'Amilee* has been accompanied with *Kufr 'Atiqaadee*, then here, it is not *Kufr 'Atiqaadee* because the *Kufr 'Atiqaadee* differs with *Kufr 'Amilee* because it is *Kufr* of the heart. But the *Kufr 'Amilee* is not *Kufr* of the heart, it is only *Kufr* in actions.

[Comments]: And this is the same as before, again in reference to those actions which do not nullify Imaan completely as will become clear in the next paragraph or two. However, Abu Fulaan al-Kanadi, has already twisted and distorted the Shaikh's intent, and made his reference to al-kufr al-'amali to also be in reference to the actions which are major kufr as well. And this is fabrication upon the Shaikh. Remember, the Shaikh's categorisation of kufr is a) al-kufr al-i'tiqaadee, which is the beliefs, statements and actions that nullify Imaan, and b) al-kufr al-'amali, which are the actions that do not nullify Imaan. So when the Shaikh is speaking about al-kufr al-'amali, he is speaking about the actions that do not nullify Imaan. Now let us see how the author of the “Decisive Refutation” has refuted Imaam al-Albaani.³¹[/Comments]

Imaan (as is crystal clear from the context) and yet this one infers from the Shaikh's words something that the Shaikh does not even intend, and which cannot even be inferred from the Shaikh's words. Evil words O Sunni, evil words indeed...The Shaikh is in one valley and Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie is in another valley.

³¹ THE SHALLOW QUTUBI UNDERSTANDING [5]

And the author of the decisive refutation added a lengthy comment here. Let us take a look at it bit by bit. He first stated, **“And the Kufr in actions indicates that the Eemaan, which was in the heart, has been nullified. It does not provide a direct indication of what form of Kufr exists in the heart (i.e. Istih'laal, Kibr, Kur'h etc.), but it does indicate that the heart was completely devoid of any Eemaan. This is because the Prophet (sallallahu alaihi wasallam) has said, ‘There is a piece of flesh in the body if it becomes good (reformed) the whole body becomes good but if it gets spoilt the whole body gets spoilt and that is the heart.’ (Bukhaaree) So it isn't possible for a heart to have Eemaan while the body knowingly commits actions of Kufr Al-Akbaar.”**

Again, Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie continues in his confusion – and after his twisting of Shaikh al-Albaani's intent – now continues to persist upon his discussion of the actions of major kufr which negate Imaan, despite the fact that the context is clearly those actions that do not negate Imaan. What he has stated above is correct, in the context of actions of major kufr, but the Shaikh is talking about actions of minor kufr, that do not negate Imaan.

Let us quote the rest of his comments. This passage is lengthy, but read it and understand it well, and what we stated earlier about the plot and agenda of the Qutubiyyah will become manifestly clear to you, may Allaah have mercy upon you and protect your ears from the Shubuhaat. Their plot of using examples of acts of major kufr in order to extract certain principles, and to then make analogies between these situations and contexts with the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, so that their true and real objective can be realised.

He then said, **“And also what proves the link of the Kufr Al-Akbaar upon the limbs indicating that all the Eemaan in the heart is nullified, is his saying “Verily, if a slave makes a mistake, (and according to another narration) ...if he commits a sin, a black dot is placed on his heart. So if he struggles and makes Istaghfaar and makes Tauba, his heart is cleared. But if he returns (to that sin), it is increased until his heart is enveloped (with blackness) and it is the covering that Allaah mentioned:**

Nay! But on their hearts is the Rân (covering of sins and evil deeds) which they used to earn.” (“Saheeh Sunan at-Tirmidhi”, #2654) So if the sins cover the heart until it is completely covered, then what about the unforced Kufr Al-Akbaar of the person who was not ignorant of the impermissibility of

his act? And the rules for actions of Kufr are the same as those of statements of Kufr because a person only has two sides; an inside and an outside. And as far as acts and statements of Kufr Al-Akbaar, both of them are issued from the outside and they both indicate the Kufr of the inside.

And Shaykh Al-Islaam, Ibn Taymiyah, may Allaah be merciful to him said, "The root of Eemaan and Nifaaq begins in the heart and what is demonstrated from statements and actions is a branch from it and an evidence for it. So if something from that is demonstrated from a man then that judgment is placed upon him. So when the Most Glorified informed (us) that the ones who accused the Prophet (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam)(of not distributing the Zakaat equally) and those who harmed him from the Munafiqeen, this was established that this was an evidence for their Nifaaq and a branch from it. And it is known that when a branch of something and its evidence appears, then its origin is the (same) thing that was demonstrated (i.e. If we see Kufr in the branches, then Kufr is in the roots). So it affirms that whenever this is found, then the one in whom it was found, is a Munafiq. (This), whether or not he was a Munafiq before this statement or if the Nifaaq began with that statement." ("As-Saraam al-Masluul 'ala-Shatim Ar-Rasul", Pg 34)

And finally, the one who performs these acts of Kufr Al-Akbaar without being forced and without the excuse of ignorance is certainly a Kafir on the inside as well and the proof is in His, ta'ala's saying:

Whoever disbelieved in Allāh after his belief, except him who is forced thereto and whose heart is at rest with (Eemaan) Faith but such as open their breasts to disbelief, on them is wrath from Allāh, and theirs will be a great torment. (Surah an-Nahl, 106)

And about this Ayaah, Ibn Taymiyah said, "He made everyone who speaks words of Kufr to be under the threat of punishment of the Kuffar except those who are compelled while their hearts are at rest with Eemaan. So if it is said, 'But the Most High said: ...but such as open their breasts to disbelief...' It is said to them (in answer), 'And this is said in compliance to its (i.e. the Ayaah's) beginning because anyone who disbelieves without being compelled, has opened his breast to Kufr. And if it weren't like that, then the nullification of its beginning would have come at its end. And if the meaning of 'whoever disbelieved', was the one who opened his breast to Kufr – that would be without compulsion – then He would not have only made an exception to the one who was compelled, rather it would have been obligatory to make an exception for the one who is compelled and the one who is not compelled – if he says the words of Kufr, willingly then he has opened his breast to it and that is Kufr." ("Al-Fataawa", Vol. 7/220)

And Shaykh Muhammad Ibn Abdul-Wahhab said, in his explanation of this Ayaah, "So Allaah did not excuse anyone from them except the one who is compelled while his heart is at rest with Eemaan. But anyone besides these who commit Kufr after their Eemaan, whether he did it out of fear or willingly in order to please someone, or due to an extreme pressure from within him or for his family or his people or his wealth or he did it out of joking or other than that, from the things, which aren't (covered in the definition) from compulsion. And the Ayaah indicates this in two ways: Firstly, His statement: ...except him who is forced thereto... So Allaah did not make an exception except for he who is compelled. And the second was His, the Most High's statement: That is because they loved and preferred the life of this world over that of the Hereafter. So He made clear that this Kufr and this punishment was not because of belief or ignorance or hate for the Deen or love of Kufr, rather its cause was only a factor from the factors of the (love of this) life. So it had an affect upon his Deen." ("Majmoo'at at-Tawheed", Pg. 88-89). End of his comment.

Now, do you remember earlier O Sunni, how we mentioned that the Qutubiyyah use examples of acts that are major kufr and which do not require the likes of Juhood (rejection), Istihlaal (making something unlawful to be lawful) and the likes. They use these examples, which are indeed true, then they infer the principles from these actions and then attempt to apply them to the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed. And this is the ploy of Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie – whose plot is all but manifest, walhamdulillaah. So he has quoted all of these examples, and yet they are actually irrelevant to the discussion because Shaikh al-Albaani's words revolve around actions which do not negate Imaan and which are not major kufr. And this becomes clear in the Shaikh's next set of statements.

“...(the *Shaykh* continues) Take, for example, the *Saheeh Hadeeth*, which is agreed upon and that is, his ’s saying, ‘Swearing at a Muslim is *Fusuq* and fighting him is *Kufr*.” A Muslim fighting against his fellow Muslim is *Kufr*. Now I ask you, a Muslim fighting a Muslim; has he disbelieved by this fighting?”

Questioner: “He does not disbelieve because this is *Kufr Al-Asghar*.”

Answer from the Shaykh: *Ya Akhee*, may Allaah bless you. The best of words are those which are short and precise! Fine. This is *Kufr*. So you call it *Kufr Al-Asghar* and I call it *Kufr ‘Amilee*.

[Comments]: The Shaikh now gives an example to illustrate his intent, by using the example of a hadeeth which describes the act of fighting against a Muslim as being kufr. And here we can see all along that the Shaikh’s intent is the kufr of action that does not negate Imaan. However, the question is still trying to get his point across which is amongst the actions are those that are major kufr and which expel from the religion. But the Shaikh does not negate this, and he considers such actions to be from al-kufr al-i’tiqadee. However, at this stage the context of the Shaikh’s point is still centred around the actions that do not negate Imaan totally. But what did Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie understand? What the Shaikh is intending in the last of his statements above is that it makes no difference if you call it al-kufr al-‘amali or al kufr al-asghar, because both of these terms point to the same reality (since the Shaikh considers that al-kufr al-‘amali, as a term, refers only to those actions which do not negate Imaan, such as the ones he is illustrating. So this statement is related to terminological usage, and is not related to his negation of the existence of those actions which can expel from Islaam (such as kicking the Qur’an or prostrating to an idol). However Abu Fulaan al-Kanadi has taken this to mean the Shaikh claims no actions at all are from the major kufr and this is an error. Read this footnote³² to see how he commented on the last of the Shaikhs’ sentences quoted above. [/Comments]

³² **THE SHALLOW QUTUBI UNDERSTANDING [6]**

He commented here with the following:

So the Shaykh has confirmed here that he considers all actions of Kufr to all be Kufr Al-Asghar except when they are accompanied with Kufr Al-Atiqadee....

And this is a lie because the Shaikh is only talking about those actions which are al-kufr al-‘amali which do not expel from the religion. This is but twisting and distorting the Shaikh’s intent, wal-Iyaadhu billaah.

And he has confirmed that he only considers the Kufr in the heart to be what takes one outside the Milla of Islaam.

What is all this deception and what are all these lies!!!. What is all this baatil (falsehood). What will you then say about the saying of the Shaikh, “And amongst the actions are those on account of which a person actually disbelieves with the kufr of belief (i.e. apostatises). **This is because such actions show his disbelief with certainty and decisiveness in the sense that when a person commits them, it is as if he is actually expressing his disbelief with his tongue, such as the one who kicks the Qur’an while he knows it is the Qur’an and intending to kick it, deliberately...**” Refer to Fitnah of Takfir (p.72, 1st edition, 1417H). By Allaah, this

individual has extremely poor understanding. He is attempting to ascribe Irjaa' to an Imaam of the Sunnah, and he is not even familiar with the Shaikh's scores of other statements on the subject(!). And this is the way of the Pseudo-Intellectual Pretenders...

But we have proven that anyone who performs acts of Kufr willingly, while not being excused due to ignorance, has Kufr Al-'Atiqaadee by necessity.

And this is the very creed of Imaam al-Albaani himself, O Beguiled One!! Refer to the statements of the Shaikh quoted earlier, and refer also to the article MSC060006, in which the Shaikhs' position on Takfir and Apostasy is made clear.

But the truth is that the Kufr upon the limbs is what nullifies the Eemaan in the heart and not the other way around.

And here he displays his confusion. We need to explain this statement a bit further. The truth is that the act of kufr upon the limbs (which is major kufr) nullifies Imaan when we know that it occurred wilfully (with qasd, intent) and with knowledge that it is unlawful (ilm). This is all we need to know in order to say that this act has nullified this person's Imaan and hence he is a Kaafir, externally and internally. This is from the point of view of applying the Sharee'ah rulings upon him.

Now where Abu Fulaan has become confused, is that he does not also realise the presence of the link between the heart and the limbs, and that whatever occurs on the limbs, then the impetus for it began in the heart. However, we do not know what exactly it was in the heart, was it hypocrisy (nifaaq), doubt (shakk), istikbaar (pride, arrogance), kurh (dislike, hatred) istihzaa' (mockery) and the likes. Either, way, whether we know or we don't know, all we need to do when an act of major kufr is committed is to make sure the conditions for takfir are present (ilm and qasd) and the barriers are removed (jahl, ikraah, ta'weel and the likes). When we have gone through this and the conditions are fulfilled for takfir, then this person's act of major kufr has made him a kaafir (without us even looking into what is in his heart). And this is for those acts which are clearly major kufr. However, this at the same time, does not negate that the cause for the act was something in his heart, since his actions are always indicative of what is in the heart, since the heart is the king of the body, when it is sound, all of it is sound and when it is corrupt all of the body is corrupt. There is a link between the heart and the limbs and the heart is the asl, foundation, and what occurs on the limbs, gives evidence (daleel) to what is in the heart – as we have already seen in Part 1, from the various quotations from Shaikh ul-Islaam Ibn Taymiyyah. So whatever occurred upon his limbs, then it was in his heart and whatever was in his heart, then it occurred upon the limbs. So the statement above, **“But the truth is that the Kufr upon the limbs is what nullifies the Eemaan in the heart and not the other way around”**... is not accurate. From the point of view of making the judgement of takfir, when we see this action occur, and the required conditions are met, yes the commission of the act itself nullifies the person's Imaan internally and externally, but that does not negate at the same time, the link between what occurred on the limbs and the heart, and that the heart is the asl, foundation or root, of what occurs on the limbs.

So with this clarification, we can see that Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie is confused to the bone, and he has not been granted success in understanding these details, and as a result of which he has committed his heinous crime of lying upon Shaikh al-Albaani, accusing him with falsehood, and twisting and distorting the Shaikh's words. Anyway, then he continued to give the following examples, which are all out of place here...

Remember Shaykh Al-Islaam's Tafseer of the following Ayaah:

They swear by Allâh that they said nothing (bad), but really they said the word of disbelief, and they disbelieved after accepting Islâm... (Surat at-Tauba, 74)

“He (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) was ordered to say to them that they disbelieved after their Eemaan. And the saying of those who declare about these verses, ‘They disbelieved after their Eemaan with their tongues while the Kufr already existed in their hearts,’ is not correct because the Eemaan upon the tongue while Kufr is present in the heart is Kufr (already). So (these people) claim that it is not to be said, “You have

disbelieved after your Eemaan”, because (according to these people), they never stopped being Kuffar in the first place. And even if they mean, “You’ve demonstrated Kufr after you demonstrated Eemaan,” (this is also incorrect) because they did not demonstrate anything to anyone except to their own people (i.e. they said their statements to each other). And they were always (demonstrating) the same thing among their people. But (this is not correct either because) when they committed Nifaaq, they were worried that a Surah might be sent down revealing what was in their hearts from Nifaaq and their uttering mocking statements. So the wording (of the verses) does not indicate that they were always Munafiqeen.” (“Al-Fataawa”, Vol. 7/272)

And he said elsewhere, “Whoever swears at Allaah and His Messenger out of mocking while not being forced and whoever says words of Kufr out of mocking while not being forced and whoever makes fun of Allaah and his signs and His Messenger, then he is a Kafir on his inside and his outside. And those who say, ‘The one like this (description) may be a believer in Allaah on the inside while is only a Kafir in his outside,’ – then surely he has uttered a saying of evil mischief in the Deen!” (“Al-Fataawa”, Vol. 7/557)

These quotations and examples are out of context here, since the context of the discussion is not in relation to these types of actions. Rather, what they prove is the link and relationship between the heart and limbs, and that what is upon the limbs must be in the heart, and what is in the heart will show upon the limbs. As for the first of Shaikh ul-Islam’s statements, then that is out of place here because firstly it is in relation to an act of major kufr, which is uttering kufr, knowingly and wilfully, and secondly it is in refutation of those who claimed that these people were already Kaafir, with the kufr of Nifaaq. As for the second statement above, then that is in refutation of the Extreme Murji’ah who say that the one who commits actions of kufr (that expel from Islaam), then he can be a Kaafir on the outside, but a Believer on the inside, because they held Imaan to be either tasdeeq alone, or to be ma’rifah alone. And this again, has got nothing to do with the context of the discussion, because Imaam al-Albaani’s words are centred around those actions which do not negate Imaan totally.

Rather, if we revisit the saying of the Shaikh, “And amongst the actions are those on account of which a person actually disbelieves with the kufr of belief (i.e. apostatises). **This is because such actions show his disbelief with certainty and decisiveness in the sense that when a person commits them, it is as if he is actually expressing his disbelief with his tongue, such as the one who kicks the Qur’an while he knows it is the Qur’an and intending to kick it, deliberately...**” Refer to Fitnah of Takfir (p.72, 1st edition, 1417H).

So has the Shaikh said that such a one already had kufr in his heart, before he committed the act, such that he was already a kaafir, by way of takdheeb? Or does the Shaikh hold that such a one is a Kaafir on the outside and yet a Believer on the inside?! Subhaanallaah!

And this act of kufr on the outside is fundamentally tied to the heart and its actions (a principle that the Murji’ah negate). And could indicate any one of either, istikbaar (pride), kurh (hatred), ‘inaad (wilful objection, refusal), nifaaq (hypocrisy) and so on...

But as for the Murji’ah they say this act is not kufr, but shows that there is takdheeb (internal rejection) in the heart, in the sense a person is a kaafir on the inside, already, and hence he did this act. And this act is not kufr and he did not become a disbeliever through the act, but on account of what is already in his heart of takdheeb. So they negate that the outside actions are fundamentally tied to the inside actions of the heart [since they hold Imaan is only tasdeeq in the heart, and not its actions as well (like love, fear, hope, submission, remorse, intention, compliance etc.), and likewise, that kufr is takdheeb in the heart and not its actions as well (like pride, arrogance, hatred, mockery etc.)].

So this means that Shaykh Nasir, may Allaah be merciful to him, had the wrong understanding of Eemaan and Kufr and it was based on Irjaa’ because it is a separation between actions and Eemaan and this lead to an incorrect concept of Takfeer and what it requires.

And all of this means that Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie is Jaahil to the Bone, with an extremely poor understanding, and who has let loose the tongue of discord against the Imaam of Ahl us-Sunnah in our times, exposing no-one but his own foolish self. This individual has still not admitted and acknowledged that the Shaikh is speaking in

“...(the *Shaykh* continues) So what is the difference between me and you? Now we see this is *Kufr 'Amilee*. Why? Because it is an action from the actions of the *Kuffar* and because the *Kuffar*, by their nature, as it has been proven, will always and forever fight amongst themselves and the Prophet (**sallallaahu alaihi wasallam**) pointed this out and this re-enforces our position against you (i.e. the questioner) and your *Ta'weel* (interpretation) that this *Kufr* is *Kufr Al-Asgaar*. Also, what helps us provide the *Tafseer* that it (the issue of Muslims fighting one another) is *Kufr Al-'Amilee*, is his (**sallallaahu alaihi wasallam**) saying, in the Final *Hajj*, as it has come in '*Saheeh Al-Bukhaaree*', in the *Hadeeth* of Jareer bin Abdullah Al-Bajadee, 'The Messenger of Allaah (**sallallaahu alaihi wasallam**) said to him, 'Assemble the people for me.' So he (**sallallaahu alaihi wasallam**) addressed the people and said, 'Do not turn into *Kuffar* after me striking each other's necks.' The word 'striking each other's necks'...there is no doubt that this is an action and it is the *Tafseer* of his (**sallallaahu alaihi wasallam**) saying earlier – 'Do not turn into *Kuffar* after me striking each other's necks.' – how? By 'striking each other's necks'. So this is *Kufr 'Amilee*. 'Swearing at a Muslim is *Fusu'uq* and fighting him is *Kufr*.' So it does not take him outside the *Milla* but if the fighting of a Muslim against his Muslim brother is accompanied by him making his blood *Halaal* in his heart, while being certain that he is a Muslim...at this point, the *Kufr 'Amilee* becomes *Kufr 'Atiqadee*.

[Comments]: And this makes the whole context of the discussion of Shaikh al-Albaani crystal clear and illustrates the extremely poor understanding – and in fact the evil intention – of this newly arisen pseudo intellectual who has taken upon himself to discuss and evaluate the *aqidah* of Imaam al-Albaani, the while he is devoid of knowledge, guidance and light. The Shaikh has always been referring to those actions that do not negate Imaan totally and is trying to get the point across that such actions require a condition of the heart, such as *istihlaal*. Now because, the context of the discussion is ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, the Shaikh is leading up to his point, which he will make, which is that ruler becomes a *kaafir* when he makes lawful his act of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed. Now this topic requires its own discussion, which will be addressed in due course, however the point is that this is the flow of the discussion. Now let us see the depths of debauchery and the depths of desire and ignorance... Read this footnote to see the comments added by Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie(!)³³. [/Comments].

the context of actions that do not negate Imaan. Yet he has twisted the words of the Shaikh and made them carry meanings and imports that the Shaikh does not actually intend, wal-Iyaadhu billaah.

³³ THE SHALLOW QUTUBI UNDERSTANDING [7]

Now let us look at the epitome of *talbees* (deception) and *kadhib* (lying) and *baatil* (falsehood) and *jahl* (ignorance) and *hawaa* (desire). Reflect carefully on the fraud in his comments:

He commented here, **"These kinds of statements are those that I first mentioned in my first emails, which is the heart of Irjaa'. Let's summarize the Shaykh's points here. He has said that this Kufr of fighting a Muslim is only Kufr when it is accompanied with him making his blood Halaal. This is true but not for the reasons the Shaykh is using. According to Ahl us-Sunnah, it is only Kufr if he makes his blood Halaal because this act is only at the level of Kufr Al-Asgaar. But the Shaykh has stated that the reason why this act of Kufr does not nullify his Eemaan is the fact that it occurred on the limbs. But the truth is that this act of Kufr does not nullify his Eemaan because it isn't Kufr Al-Akbaar.**

And the Shaikh is not even talking about actions of al-kufr al-akbar at all, rather the context of his discussion is as clear as daylight...But this beguiled one, has mixed together two concepts in his words above and given the impression that what he himself is negating (meaning that istihlaal is not required for acts of major kufr), is being affirmed by Imaam al-Albaani. The sick mind of Abu Fulaan has fallen into slyly treating two separate matters in the same light or mixing them together, and making it look as if what the Shaikh has applied in one context (i.e. al-kufr al-'amali that does not expel from Islaam), is also applied by him in all other contexts (the acts of major kufr).

But the truth is that this act of Kufr does not nullify his Eemaan because it isn't Kufr Al-Akbaar.

And this is exactly, why the Shaikh put the condition of istihlaal upon it, because it is not kufr akbar, and he is not even talking about actions of kufr akbar(!). What is all this deception?! This talbees?! This bent and crooked talk? Wal-Iyaadhu Billaah. Repent from your wicked lies and distortions of debauchery!!

In other words it is only a sin.

Which is why the Shaikh has used this example (and not the example of kicking the Qur'an(!)). What more can be said to the blind in both vision and insight?!

And we know that sins decrease the Eemaan but they do not nullify it completely. So the Shaykh has put the condition of making this Halaal which is what the Murji'yah make as conditions as well.

O Sunni, Look at this talbees (deception). Just look at this pitiful fraud. Look at how he has carefully deceived the reader from the starting to end of this section in his comments. Look at how he has mixed two different matters together, attempted to pull the wool over the reader's eyes and then finally attempted to make the lie he has wanted to make all along, thinking he will not be caught out, scolded and rebuked, and made into a laughing stock. The Shaikh is specifying the condition of Istihlaal for sins that do not expel from Islaam, then comes this person of desires and lies upon the Shaikh with a mighty fabrication and uses this despicable type of deception and claims that this is what the Murji'ah do as well(!) –making the reader forget that the Shaikh is talking about the acts that do not negate Imaan totally.

In this case he is correct but he applies this condition to all acts of Kufr, even if they are in reality, Kufr Al-Akbaar. And this is his error. And this is an example of his Irjaa'.

And this is but baatil to the bone, and a clear fabrication against the Shaikh. The Shaikh has put the condition of Istihlaal for those sins which do not reach the level of major kufr, which the Shaikh calls al-kufr al-'amali. And Abu Fulaan al-Kanadi has but twisted the Shaikh's words and lied upon him. Rather the Shaikh does not specify the condition of istihlaal for acts of major kufr, such as kicking the Qur'an, reviling the Messenger (salallaahu alaihi wasallam) and the likes.

And the Shaykh has confirmed that only Kufr Al-'Atiqaadee can be Akbaar.

And for this we need to refer back to the understanding of the Shaikh as to what enters into al-kufr al-i'tiqaadee, and this is where the confusion and ignorance of Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie lies. If one refers back to Part 1 of this discourse, and takes a look at the various types of understandings that exist on the categorisation of kufr, then we can clearly see the error in what Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie has claimed above. Al-Albaani considers that beliefs, **statements and actions** that expel from Islaam are from al-kufr al-i'tiqaadee.

But this means that the Shaykh, may Allaah be merciful to him, did not consider any actions to be able to nullify Eemaan on their own without being accompanied with belief which initiated it.

And here we see further the talbees (deception) coming from Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie. Rather, the Shaikh considers actions to be able to nullify Imaan, such as reviling the Messenger (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) or kicking the Qur'aan (with the conditions of knowledge and intent (al-ilm wal-qasd) for the judgement of takfir. And he considers these acts to be kufr both upon the limbs and in the heart, and he considers all of this to be al-kufr al-i'tiqaadee, even though it may cause the nose of al-Kanadie to be dragged along the ground. Has he

“...(the *Shaykh* continues) “You use as evidence the *Ijmaa'*, which has been narrated by people from the past and people from this era. You must have read the *Tafseer* of the Imaams for the likes of His, *tabaaraka wa ta'ala*’s saying:

not yet heard the Shaikh’s own words in that discussion with Shaikh Ubaylaan (in MSC060006), which al-Kanadie knows was a refutation of his own futile and wicked lies...

As for this comment, some clarification is needed here, because the wording of Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie has some truth mixed with falsehood. Every action that nullifies Imaan on its own, then what is meant is that it necessitates kufr both externally and internally. These types of acts are accompanied with something in the heart. For example, when someone kicks the Qur’aan, and he was not mad, possessed or the likes, then he did not kick that Qur’aan for no reason, randomly, while he knew it is the Qur’aan and that it is forbidden to disrespect it. There was something in his heart that accompanied this act, since the heart is the asl, foundation and what occurs upon the limbs is a branch of it. Hence, it could have been either dislike (*kurh*), or pride and arrogance (*istikbaar*), or wilful resistance (*inaad*), or hypocrisy (*nifaaq*) and the likes. This is from the point of view of the link between the internal and the external. However, we may not know what exactly it was, but that is not our concern. What we need to do is to make sure that the conditions of takfir are met, so if he did this action with intent (*qasd*) and knew it was wrong or haraam or disrespect and so on (*‘ilm*), then this person is a Kaafir, externally and internally, even though we do not know what made him do it on the inside (whether hypocrisy, or doubt, or juhood, or arrogance, or pride, and so on to all the various types of kufr).

As for the Murji’ah they say that takdheeb (rejection in the heart) was the cause of kufr, that the act itself was not kufr, but it indicates takdheeb that exists in the heart, and this is why the person has disbelieved, and they restrict it to this matter for all acts and statements of kufr. In reality, this saying of theirs is another manifestation of their belief that the heart is separate from the actions.

So Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie but wallows in deceit and equivocation and other such mannerisms, and from Allaah is refuge.

Isn’t this the Irjaa’ that we pointed out in the beginning? Isn’t this a level of separating actions from Eemaan? What this means is that all actions of Kufr, no matter what level they are, are only sins. Isn’t that what the Murji’yah say?

No, No and No to all three questions. The Murji’ah say that whatever is major kufr on the outside (such as kicking the Qur’aan, reviling the religion etc.) is either not kufr at all, or that it is kufr because of takdheeb in the heart. So they restrict it to Takdheeb.

In the context of the above passage of the Shaikh, the Shaikh has correctly specified the condition of istihlaal for those acts that do not reach the level of major kufr that expels from the religion (when the conditions exist and the barriers are removed). And this has been the context all along. Then Abu Fulaan tries to use this crystal clear explanation and this crystal clear context and tries to fool his own self and to convince his shallow understanding that the Shaikh is putting the right conditions but for the wrong reasons(!). This is not separating actions from Imaan at all. In fact, the saying of Imaam al-Albaani is the exact same as what Ibn al-Qayyim has stated:

Ibn al-Qayyim said, “...And the Messenger of Allaah (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam) negated Imaan from the fornicator, thief, and the one who consumes khamr, intoxicants. And also from the one whose neighbours are not safe from his evil. **So when the label of Imaan has been negated from such a one, then he is a disbeliever from the point of view of his action**, but the kufr of juhood and belief (*i’tiqad*) has been negated from him. It is likewise in his (sallallaahu alaihi wasallam’s) saying, “Do not become disbelievers after me, striking the necks of one another.” Kitaab us-Salaat of Ibn al-Qayyim.

Subhaanallaah! What can be said to the blind? And all of this is but a sign of the neo-Qutubite doctrine which has led to the perversion of many of the sons of Ahl us-Sunnah, and their stooping to the lowest depths of intellectual decrepitude.

And whosoever does not judge by what Allâh has revealed, such are the Kâfirûn. I mean that the Ayaah was revealed for the Jews who would force each other to ask the Messenger because they were two groups. So they would send one of them to ask Muhammad and if he answered favorably to them, they accepted it otherwise, they rejected it. And from the famous well-known leaders of the *Mufasireen*, Ibn Jareer At-Tabaree said in his *Tafseer* of this Ayaah, **...such are the Kâfirûn** 'because they do not believe in the *Hukm* of the Messenger of Allaah (**sallallaahu alaihi wasallam**) in their hearts because they originally disbelieved in the Messenger of Allaah (**sallallaahu alaihi wasallam**) unless he judges in their favor. At this time, they accept the *Hukm* because it is in their favor but if it is not in their favor, they reject it with their hearts and by changing it. And because of that, he...I mean Ibn Jareer and Ibn Katheer...approved that it is not allowed to apply this Ayaah upon a Muslim *Fajar/Fasiq* who believes in what Allaah *az'awajaal* revealed but rules either according to himself or according to other than himself or other than him with other than the *Hukm* of Allaah *az'awajaal* in His Book or His Prophet (**sallallaahu alaihi wasallam**) in his *Sunnah*...

[Comments]: **At this point Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie added a lengthy note on ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed attempting to refute the Shaikh's explanation here, and claiming that the Shaikh is in error.** But since it relates to something that is a topic in itself and requires detail, it will not be covered in this part, but in a future part of this series inshaa'allaah. So from this statement of Shaikh al-Albaani and the statement below, the whole context of the discussion becomes clear, in that when the questioner attempted to pass off ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed as being major kufr, the Shaikh wanted to build up the answer to him by explaining to him the difference between kufr in belief and kufr in action. And because the tafseel of the Salaf is well known concerning this issue, namely that there is both kufr of belief and kufr of action in ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, the Shaikh wanted to explain that to the questioner. Of course, it is clear that there was some misunderstandings about the terms being used and how they were being applied (such as al-kufr al-akbar, al-kufr al-asghar, al-kufr al-'amali, al-kufr al-i'tiqadi, kufr ar-riddah). However, Abu Fulaan al-Kanadi took advantage of this in order to portray to the reader that the Shaikh negates that there are any actions which are major kufr –and indeed we have quoted from the words of the Shaikh that which declares this individual to have lied upon the Shaikh!![/Comments].

“(the *Shaykh* continues) it is not allowed to apply this Ayaah upon the *Muslimeen* because they are different than the *Mushriqeen* because they believe in what Allaah has revealed, however, their *Eemaan* in what Allaah revealed was not accompanied by actions while these *Kuffar* rejected what Allaah revealed in their hearts. And because of this, the *Ulamaa'* of the *Muslimeen*, in the *Tafseer* of this Ayaah, which is used by many of the people who hold onto the unrestricted *Takfeer* and from it is your saying that *Kufr 'Amilee* could be *Kufr* which takes you outside the *Milla* and you did not see that it is impossible for the *Kufr 'Amilee* to take you outside the *Milla* unless the *Kufr* has become **an action of the heart** of the *Kafir*³⁴. It is

³⁴ Reflect here, and note how the Shaikh said, “an action of the heart” and he did not say “takdheeb in the heart”(!). For the Murji'ah restrict kufr to the passing away of tasdeeq (i.e. the speech of the heart), whereas Ahl us-Sunnah say that kufr is also comprised in the passing away of the actions of the heart. And actions of the heart could be dislike (kurh), or istihlaal (making something lawful), or istikbaar (arrogance) or nifaaq

Wajib to differentiate between the *Kufr 'Amilee* and the *Kufr 'Atiqaadee*. We do not find in the *Sharee'ah* any text, which clearly indicates that the one who believes in what Allaah revealed, is a *Kafir*. The one for example, who takes *Riba*...what is his *Hukm*? Is he a *Kafir/Mortad* from the *Deen*? You are going to say, 'No.' Isn't this true?"

Questioner: "Yes."

[Comments]: And all of this now goes to reaffirm what we said right at the beginning, and we will quote it again:

In his personal letter sent to Shaikh Abdul-Azeez Aal ash-Shaikh, Mufti of Saudi Arabia and head of the Permanent Committee, shortly after the issuing of the verdict concerning Shaikh Ali Hasan's two books on the subject of takfir and ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, Shaikh Sa'd al-Hussain stated, "As for these brothers (the Jordanian Mashaayikh), I have known them for around fifteen years... and they by Allaah, are the best of those I know - I do not say in Jordan alone - but in the whole of Shaam, in terms of knowledge, manhaj (methodology) and da'wah (calling to Allaah)... **As for this doubt of Irjaa' which Shaytaan has placed upon the tongues of their opponents**, then they (the opponents) have only made this accusation against them because they are calling to the Manhaj of Nubuwwah (Prophetic Methodology), **the manhaj that opposes the ways and methods of the Takfeeris (takfeeriyyoon) such as the likes of Sayyid Qutb, Hasan at-Turaabi and others amongst the biased partisans and political activists...**" (Refer to "Rihlati Ilaa Bilaad ul-Haramayn")

In his reply to the Permanent Committee, Shaikh Ali Hasan al-Halabi had noted, "**And I know with full and perfect certainty, without a shred of doubt, that the issues in which discussions have increased these days - such as the promotion of the discussion of the issues of Imaan, Kufr, Irjaa, Action ('amal), condition (shart) and validity (sihhah) - and in this particular manner - that all of this is directed towards and centered - with such persistence - upon a single issue and no other, and that is the issue of the takfir of the rulers.**" (Ajwibah al-Mutalaa'imah p.42).

And this actually what that unfortunate doctor who neither knew the reality of Irjaa' and nor those whom he accused with it, this is what his thesis was about. And because Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie – as it has become clearly apparent – has but relied upon the polemic and sophistry of the unfortunate doctor, Safar al-Hawaali, who is attempting to pass off the manhaj of Sayyid Qutb, as Salafiyyah embodied, then it should come as no surprise, that they use this accusation of Irjaa' in order to abolish the tafseel of the Salaf on the issue of ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed, so they can be left to their revolutionary and takfiri manhaj which came to them from Qutb and Mawdoodi.

(hypocrisy), or istihzaa (mockery) and the likes. And this too is a proof against Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie, and this too makes the flimsy web of Abu Fulaan to crumble in ruins...

Closing Remarks

The first great error of the author of the “Decisive Refutation” is that he has put himself in a position which he will never reach, and that is one of being able to refute Imaam al-Albaani – rahimahullaah. For he is grossly ignorant of the true and real position of the Shaikh, and instead of referring back to the students of Shaikh al-Albaani and seeking clarification from them and asking them about the true position of Shaikh al-Albaani and where he can find it in the remainder of the books or cassettes or writings of the Shaikh – he has instead turned to books of the Takfiris and neo-Kharijites, such as Abu Baseer Mustafa Haleemah, and to the doctrines of Safar al-Hawali, which in reality are the doctrines of Muhammad Qutb, his teacher and mentor and which in reality are the doctrines of Sayyid Qutb – and he has relied upon the likes of this in order to ascribe the Irjaa’ of Jahm Ibn Safwaan to Imaam al-Albaani.

In short, the author of the “Decisive Refutation” has displayed his total lack of familiarity with the creed of Imaam al-Albaani, his knowledge based understandings, and on top of that he has twisted and distorted the Shaikh’s position and made his words to carry meanings and imports that they do not even carry. And all of this is clear from what has preceded walhamdulillaah. Further, the author has illustrated his deceit and treachery quite professionally, by deciding to totally abandon the many other statements of the Shaikh which make it abundantly clear that the Shaikh performs takfir on account of actions that are major kufr, without requiring the condition of Istihlaal and the likes – and by failing to consider them in his commentary upon the Shaikh’s discussion.

The author of the “Refutation” wrote (after concluding his quotation of the passage from the cassette “Kufr Kufraan):

“As I mentioned earlier, the one whom I sent this article to, said that he would reply with his own response, which would refute my many grave errors, and until now, I still have not seen it. However, in the email correspondence, which came after my response, I came to notice that this individual seemed more interested in defending *Shaykh* Al-Albaanee’s reputation and attacking those who oppose him in the issues of *Eemaan* and *Kufr*, than he was in proving the correctness of the *Shaykh*’s opinions about *Takfeer* etc. He also seemed more interested in attacking the authors³⁵ whom I had quoted in my section on, Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed, than he was in disproving what they had said concerning the topic itself. I found this very interesting, although odd and I came to notice later, that this is quite a common strategy among these people and their readers. Since then, www.salafipublications.com has posted several articles related to *Eemaan* and *Kufr* and, Ruling by Other Than What Allaah Revealed.”

As for our response, then it soon became clear to us that this individual’s chain of narration for his teaching is Abu Baseer Mustafah Haleemah, or Safar al-Hawali, or Mohammad Qutb, and we understood perfectly well his orientation. Besides at around the same time, Shaikh Ali Hasan had written and excellent refutation of those who accused Imaam al-Albaani of Irjaa’, and we offered to send it to Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie, since it was more appropriate that

³⁵ Abu Baseer Mustafah Haleemah(!), and Mohammad Qutb(!). And perhaps al-Kanadie may wish to refer back to the slanders and insults of both of these individuals against the Salafi Mashaayikh, such as Shaikh al-Albaani, Shaikh Ibn Baaz, Shaikh Ibn Uthaimen and many other’s. Two scales, O Sunni, one for the Qutubiyyah, Khaarijiyyah Asriyyah and another one for the Salafis...

the students of the Shaikh outline their teachers real and true position. Nevertheless, he indeed had many grave and serious errors, and since he has taken it upon himself to add another 70 pages to his original 42-page article, and then to distribute it amongst the people, we will now proceed to highlight his grave and serious errors, inshaa'llaah.

As for the articles we had posted, then as is our habit, we like to base our positions on what the Ulamaa have stated. So if anyone looks at the articles related to Ruling by other than what Allaah has revealed at SP then they will realise that. Likewise, what perhaps incensed Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie is that we demolished his claims from their very foundations by the article MSC060006, which relates the Creed of Imaam al-Albaani on Takfir and Apostasy, which Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie has not been able to reply to, because it uncovered his fraud from the very foundations. Further, he had also used the words of Abu Baseer Mustafah Haleemah, a well known Takfiri in Syria, and he became angry for his sake, when we labelled him exactly what he was, a Takfiri. So his orientation was clear to us, and we wished not to waste time in refuting his article (of 42-pages) but to instead clarify the issues directly – and which was done.

But it is clear that Abu Fulaan al-Kanadie is actually angered by all of this – and may he continue in his rage, because we give him glad tidings of more Blazing Salafi Meteor's and Lighting Bolts that will be hurled at his Qutubite orientations and pseudo intellectual ramblings.

Finally we advise you, O Sunni, to read the following two articles for more insight into certain issues raised in this discourse, GRV070006 (The Difference Between the Shaikhs of ad-Da'wah as-Salafiyyah and the Qutubiyyah) and also SCL040003 (The Meaning of the Saying of the Salaf "Imaan is Speech and Action") and also MSC060006 (Imaam al-Albaani's Creed on Takfir and Apostasy).

And may the prayers and peace be upon Muhammad, his family, his companions and all those who follow in their footsteps until the hour is established.